THE VATICAN TEXT (*COD. VAT.-PALAT. LAT.* 1729) OF THE LETTERS OF DANTE.

§ I.

THROUGH the kindness of Dr Moore, Editor of the Oxford Dante, who presented me with a photographic reproduction, and generously waived his own claims in my favour, I have been enabled to make a transcript of the text of the nine letters attributed to Dante which are contained in the MS. in the Vatican (*Cod. Vaticano-Palatino Latino* 1729), to which public attention was first called by Karl Witte, in an article in a German periodical, more than seventy years ago[1].

The history of this MS., so far as it has been recovered, is an interesting one. The MS., which, besides the letters of Dante, contains the twelve eclogues of Petrarch, and Dante's *De Monarchia*[2], was executed in the fourteenth century, apparently for Francesco da Montepulciano[3], a Tuscan notary of distinction, the friend and correspondent of Coluccio Salutati, and successor of Filippo Villani in the Chancellorship of Perugia, who at the end of the eclogues has written his name, and the date 20 July, 1394[4]. Francesco da Montepulciano left his books to the capitular library of the Cathedral of Montepulciano, the greater part of which was destroyed by fire in 1539[5], but this MS. by some chance came into the possession of the Florentine scholar, Giannozzo Manetti (1396–1459)[6], whence it eventually passed into the

[1] In 1838, in his article *Neu aufgefundene Briefe des Dante Allighieri* (in *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*, Nos. 149—51), which was afterwards reprinted in *Dante-Forschungen*, I, 473—87.

[2] This was one of the MSS. which was utilised by Witte in his edition of the treatise published at Vienna in 1874 (see p. lviii).

[3] Francesco de' Piendibeni, or, to give him his full description, Francesco di Ser Jacopo di Ser Piendibene da Montepulciano (see F. Novati, *Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati*, III, 312, n. 2; and O. Zenatti, *Dante in Firenze*, pp. 378 ff.).

[4] *Francisci de Montepolitiano. Expleui corrigere* 20 *Iulii Perusii* 1394 (see Witte, *ubi supra*; and Zenatti, *op. cit.*, p. 374). For an enumeration of the portions of the MS. written in the hand of Francesco, see Zenatti, *op. cit.*, p. 378.

[5] See F. Novati, *Le Epistole di Dante*, in *Lectura Dantis: Le Opere Minori di D. A.*, p. 300.

[6] See Zenatti, *op. cit.*, pp. 370—5 note, 414—19; see also below, p. 14.

collection of the celebrated bibliophile, Ulrich Fugger (1526–1584)[1], son of Raimund Fugger, one of the famous merchant-princes of Augsburg. Ulrich Fugger, whose extravagance in the matter of books was such that at one time his family obtained a decree to restrain his expenditure, as is well known, became a Protestant, and to escape persecution took refuge in the Rhenish Palatinate, and settled at Heidelberg, where he died in 1584, leaving his extensive collection of MSS. to the library of that city. After the capture of Heidelberg by Tilly in 1622 the most valuable portion of the library, consisting of nearly 200 cases of MSS., was presented by Maximilian I of Bavaria, in return for the papal support, to Pope Gregory XV, and was transferred to Rome, and incorporated in the Vatican Library, under the superintendence of Leone Allacci[2].

Among the MSS. thus removed to the Vatican were many which had formed part of the Fugger collection, one of them being the MS. containing the nine letters attributed to Dante, which are the subject of the present article. In the Vatican this MS. appears to have lain practically unnoticed until 1837, when a German student, Theodor Heyse, who was collating MSS. of the *Divina Commedia* in the library on behalf of Witte, examined its contents and communicated to the latter a copy of the Dante letters contained in it. Witte thereupon wrote an account of the letters in the article (in *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*) already referred to[3], and prepared to publish them. But while he was engaged upon the work his portfolio containing the transcript was stolen from him, and it was more than two years before he could succeed in getting fresh copies made[4]. In the meantime, attention having been directed to the MS. by the publication of Witte's article above mentioned, one of the employés at the Vatican Library, Massi by name, took copies of the letters on his own account with the intention of anticipating Witte's projected edition. Massi, however,

[1] See Zenatti, *op. cit.*, pp. 372—4 note.

[2] Allacci, who was subsequently librarian of the Vatican (1661–9), has left an interesting account of his proceedings at Heidelberg (see Curzio Mazzi, *Leone Allacci e la Palatina di Heidelberg*, Bologna, 1893). Some idea of the extent of the collection may be gathered from the fact that Allacci estimated that the covers alone, which to facilitate transport he caused to be stripped from the MSS., amounted to thirteen waggon-loads. (*Op. cit.* p. 25.)

[3] See above, p. 1, n. 1. In this article Witte omitted to mention the name of the student to whom the discovery was due, an omission which he did not repair until four years later, in 1842, in which year he acknowledged his indebtedness to Heyse in the Appendix to the second part of *Dante Alighieri's lyrische Gedichte, übersetzt und erklärt von K. L. Kannegiesser und K. Witte* (p. 234).

[4] For this second transcript Witte was indebted once more to Theodor Heyse (see *Le Lettere di Dante scoperte dal Signor Teodoro Heyse*, in Vol. II, p. 701 of Niccolò Tommaseo's edition of the *Divina Commedia*, Milano, 1865).

was unable to obtain the necessary *imprimatur*, and he then (in the autumn of 1841) offered his copies to Alessandro Torri of Pisa, who had been for some time engaged upon an edition of the minor works of Dante. Torri availed himself of the offer, and forthwith proceeded to Rome for the purpose of collating the copies with the original MS. in the Vatican; and having satisfied himself as to their accuracy he included the nine letters in his volume, *Epistole di Dante Allighieri edite e inedite*, which was published at Leghorn in the following year (1842)[1].

Torri's edition of the letters, the text of which was severely criticised by Witte[2], was followed in 1857 by a revised edition by Fraticelli, in which were embodied the results of a fresh collation of the MSS. by Witte, who having been prevented from publishing his own projected edition, placed his notes at the disposal of Fraticelli[3]. Fraticelli's text was reprinted (with a few variations) by Giuliani in 1882, and subsequently in the several editions (1894, 1897, 1904) of the Oxford Dante[4].

In the subjoined transcript of the Vatican text the contractions of the MS. have been expanded, the expansions being printed in italics in the usual way. The punctuation of the MS., such as it is, has been preserved. The folios of the MS. [56ro—62ro] are indicated in the transcript; as are the lines (numbered in round brackets) of each separate folio. For convenience of reference each letter has been broken up into paragraphs, numbered [in square brackets] to correspond with the numbering of the sections in the Oxford Dante[5]; and the titles and colophons, which in several instances follow on continuously with the text in the MS., have been detached from the body of the letter, and printed as separate paragraphs. In all other respects the arrangement of the text in the MS. has been reproduced in the transcript.

[1] See Witte, *Dante-Forschungen*, I, 489—90; and Torri, *op. cit.*, pp. vii—viii.

[2] In his article, *Torris Ausgabe von Dantes Briefen*, in *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*, 1843, No. 341 (reprinted in *Dante-Forschungen*, I, 488—99).

[3] Fraticelli writes in his *Proemio*: 'Il dotto alemanno prof. Witte...non pago di quanto avea fatto la prima volta, volle di nuovo riscontrare i codici e confrontare le varie lezioni; e nuovamente portando il suo esame critico sopra ogni frase ed ogni parola del testo, potè rettificare molti passi disordinati, rendere intelligibili varie frasi oscure, e correggere parecchi e parecchi errori. E quantunque del suo accurato lavoro avess' egli determinato valersi per una ristampa, pure per un tratto d' impareggiabil cortesia ha voluto esserne con me liberale, affinchè io me ne giovassi per l' edizione presente. La lezione dunque del testo latino, che or per me si produce, è interamente al Witte dovuta' (*Opere minori di Dante*, ed. 1893, Vol. III, p. 408).

[4] See below, p. 5.

[5] The line-references in quotations from Dante's prose-works are to the lines as numbered in the Oxford Dante.

Each letter is provided with an *apparatus criticus* in which are registered variant readings from other MSS. (where available)[1], and from the various printed editions, and appended to each is a trial list of proposed emendations—in the Oxford text (the latest), in the case of the six letters contained in that edition; and in the text of Torri and Giuliani, in the case of the so-called Battifolle letters (see below, pp. 19—20). The letters are naturally dealt with in the order in which they occur in the MS.

§ II.

Epistola VII (To the Emperor Henry VII).

Dante's letter to the Emperor Henry VII (*Epist.* VII) is one of the three specially mentioned by Giovanni Villani in the biographical notice of Dante in his *Cronica*, where he says:

'Quando fu in esilio fece da venti canzoni morali e d' amore molto eccellenti, e in tra l' altre fece tre nobili pistole; l' una mandò al reggimento di Firenze dogliendosi del suo esilio sanza colpa[2]; l' altra mandò allo 'mperadore Arrigo quand' era all' assedio di Brescia[3], riprendendolo della sua stanza, quasi profetizzando; la terza a' cardinali italiani, quand' era la vacazione dopo la morte di papa Clemente, acciocchè s' accordassono a eleggere papa Italiano[4]; tutte in latino con alto dittato, e con eccellenti sentenzie e autoritadi, le quali furono molto commendate da' savi intenditori' (IX, 136)[5].

The Latin text of this letter has been preserved in two other MSS., besides the Vatican MS., namely in one of the fourteenth century (*Cod. S. Pantaleo* 8) in the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele at Rome[6], and in a fifteenth century Venetian MS., formerly in the Biblioteca Muranese, now in the Marciana (*Cod. Marc. Lat.* XIV, 115)[7].

This letter was first printed (in a very corrupt and mutilated form) in an early Italian translation, attributed to Marsilio Ficino, which has been preserved in a number of MSS.[8], in the *Prose Antiche di Dante*,

[1] I have unfortunately been unable as yet to procure a collation of *Cod. S. Pantaleo* 8 at Rome (see below, and p. 32).

[2] *Epist.* VI. [3] Actually, Cremona. [4] *Epist.* VIII.

[5] In the early editions of Villani this chapter is numbered 135.

[6] This MS. also contains the Latin text of Dante's letter to the Princes and Peoples of Italy (*Epist.* V). See *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana*, N.S. II (1895), p. 23 n.

[7] This is the MS. from which Witte first printed the Latin text in 1827. Witte's attention having been drawn to the fact that extracts from the letter in Latin were printed in the Catalogue of the Biblioteca Muranese, search was made, through the kind offices of the Marchese Gian Giacomo Trivulzio, by the Abate Giovanni Antonio Moschini, the Prefetto of the Biblioteca Marciana, whither the spoils of the Murano library had been transferred, with the result that the MS. containing the letter was discovered, and placed at Witte's disposal for the purposes of his projected edition of Dante's letters. (See *Dantis Alligherii Epistolae quae exstant*, cum notis Caroli Witte, Patavii, 1827, pp. 28—9.) I am in possession of a photographic reproduction of the text of *Epist.* VII in this MS., for the execution of which I am indebted to the kindness of Mr Horatio F. Brown.

[8] There are four MSS. in the Riccardiana at Florence alone (see Fraticelli, *Opere Minori di Dante*, ed. 1893, Vol. III, p. 462 n.).

Petrarcha, et Boccaccio (pp. 9—12), published at Florence in 1547 by Doni; and it was reprinted by him at Venice in 1552 in his *Zucca* (Parte iii, 'I Frutti,' pp. 69 ff.). An amended text, based on the collation of several MSS., was printed by Biscioni at Florence in 1723 in his *Prose di Dante Alighieri e di Messer Gio. Boccacci* (pp. 211—15); and yet another text, from a Riccardi MS., was printed by Ignazio Moutier at Florence in 1823, in Vol. VIII (pp. lxv—lxxi) of his edition of *La Cronica di Giovanni Villani.* Biscioni's text was reprinted by Witte, with variants from two other MSS., in his edition of Dante's letters issued at Padua in 1827.

The Latin text of the letter, the existence of which was recorded in the seventeenth century by Lorenzo Pignoria of Padua (1571—1631)[1], was first printed at Padua in 1827 by Witte, from the Venetian MS.[2], in a privately printed volume[3] entitled *Dantis Allighieri Epistolae quae exstant* (*Epist.* VI, pp. 30—46). Witte's Latin text was reprinted, with a few emendations, by Fraticelli, together with an Italian version of his own, at Florence in 1840, in *Dantis Alighierii Epistolae quae exstant* (*Epist.* III, pp. 230—49). In 1842 Torri printed the Latin text at Leghorn from the Vatican MS., which had been discovered some four years before[4], in his *Epistole di Dante Allighieri edite e inedite* (*Epist.* VII, pp. 52—60). In 1857 Fraticelli published a revised edition of the Latin text (*Opere minori di Dante,* ed. 1893, Vol. III, *Epist.* VII, pp. 464—74), based on a fresh collation of the MSS. by Witte[5]. A reprint of Fraticelli's revised text, with some emendations of his own[6], was published by Giuliani at Florence in 1882, in the second volume of his *Opere Latine di Dante* (*Epist.* VII, pp. 22—6). Finally, Fraticelli's text was once more reprinted in 1894 in the Oxford Dante (*Epist.* VII), of which a second edition, revised, was issued in 1897, and a third, more extensively revised, in 1904.

The foregoing editions are represented in the *apparatus criticus* as follows:

[1] In his notes to the *De Rebus Gestis Henrici VII* of Albertino Mussato Pignoria mentions that he had in his own possession a copy of the letter in Latin: 'Dantes vatum clarissimus hisce diebus epistolam scripsit Henrico, quam nacti in pervetusto codice nostro manuscripto publici juris facere decrevimus, et describi curavimus seorsum in calce spicilegii nostri, cum aliis nonnullis ejusdem aevi monumentis; et ejusdem epistolae meminit Jo. Villanus, lib. 9, cap. 35. Quam etiam Italicè redditam vidimus et editam Florentiae, anno 1547' (see Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, x, 385).

[2] See above, p. 4, n. 7.

[3] 'In nur 60 verschenkten Exemplaren,' wrote Witte in his article *Neu aufgefundene Briefe des Dante Allighieri* (see above, p. 1, n. 1). This volume is now exceedingly rare.

[4] See above, pp. 2—3.

[5] See above, p. 3, n. 3.

[6] Giuliani's emendations, for the most part wholly regardless of palaeographical considerations, are as often as not introduced into the text *sub silentio.*

For the Latin text, W. = Witte (1827); F^1. = Fraticelli (1840); T. = Torri (1842); F^2. = Fraticelli (1857); G. = Giuliani (1882); O^1. = Oxford Dante (1894); O^2. = do. (1897); O^3. = do. (1904); O. = do. (all three editions); W.—O. = W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.; Cod. Ven. indicates the readings of the Venetian MS.; for the Italian text, D. = Doni (1547); B. = Biscioni (1723); M. = Moutier (1823).

The first letter in the MS. (*Epist.* VII) begins at the top of fol. 56ro. The title, according to Zenatti[1], is written in the hand of Francesco da Montepulciano, the owner of the MS.[2]

Ep*isto*la Dantis Alegerii florentini ad
Henricum Cesare*m* Augustum[3].

[§ 1.] Immensa dei dilect*ione* testante relicta est nobis[4] pacis hereditas ut in (2) sua mira dulcedine militie no*stre* dura mitescere*nt* et in usu ei*us* (3) patrie trihumphantis[5] gaudia mereremur. At liuor antiqui et (4) implacab*i*lis hostis h*uma*ne pro*sper*itati semp*er* et latanter[6] *in*sidians no*n* nul-(5)-los exheredando uolentes ob tutoris absentiam non[7] alios *im*pios[8] (6) denudauit *in*uitos. hinc diu sup*er*[9] flumina co*n*fusionis defleuim*us* (7) et patrocinia iusti Regis *in*censanter[10] *im*plorabam*us*[11] qui satellitium (8) seui tiranj disperderet *et* nos *in* nos*t*ra Iustitia reformaret. Cu*m*q*ue* (9) tu Cesaris et Augusti successor ape*n*ninj iuga transiliens uener-(10)-anda signa tarpeia[12] retulisti pro-tin*us* longa substiteru*nt* suspiria la-(11)-crimar*um* q*ue* diluuia[13] desieru*nt*.

[1] *Dante in Firenze*, p. 378. [2] See above, p. 1.

[3] In Cod. Ven. the letter is headed: *Sanctissimo Triumphatori & domino singulari, domino Henrico, divina providentia Romanorum rege, semper augusto devotissimi sui Dantes Aldigherij florentinus & exul immeritus, ac universaliter omnes Thusci, qui pacem desiderant terre, obsculum ante pedes.* Witte prints *Regi* for (the incorrect) *rege*; *Alligherius* for *Aldigherij*; *Tusci* for *Thusci*; and *osculantur pedes* for *osculum ante pedes.* In the Italian version (as printed by Doni) the letter is headed: *Pistola di Dante Alighieri Poeta Fiorentino all' Imperator' Arrigo di Luzimborgo. Al gloriosissimo et felicissimo triomphatore et singolar Signore Messer' Arrigo, per la divina providenza Re de Romani et sempre accrescitore*, i suoi devotissimi, Dante Alighieri Fiorentino, et non meritevolmente sbandito, et tutti i Toscani universalmente, che pace desiderano, mandano baci alla terra dinanzi a vostri piedi.*

[4] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *nobis est.* [5] Cod. Ven. *triumphis.*

[6] W.—O. *latenter*; Cod. Ven. *conlatenter.* [7] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *nos.*

[8] Cod. Ven. W.F^1. *impie*; T.F^2.G.O. *impius*; D.B.M. *crudelmente.*

[9] Cod. Ven. *semper.* [10] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *incessanter.*

[11] W.F^1. *imploravimus*; Cod. Ven. *imploravimus et*; T.F^2.G.O. *implorabamus.*

[12] Cod. Ven. *turpia.* [13] Cod. Ven. *diluuię.*

* The medieval derivation of *Augustus* was from *augeo*, hence the translation of the title as *accrescitore*. The same rendering of *Augustus* occurs in the Italian translation of *Epist.* V (§ 3). Uguccione da Pisa, in his *Magnae Derivationes*, says: 'Ab *augeo, augustus*, quilibet romanus imperator, ab augendo imperium.'

Et ceu[1] titan *pr*eoptatus[2] exori*en*s (12) noua spes latio *secu*lj melioris effulsit. Tunc plerique uota sua (13) *pr*euenientes in iubilo t*am* saturnia regna q*uam* uirgine*m* redeunte*m* (14) cu*m* Marone cantaba*n*t.

[§ 2.] Veru*m* q*uia* sol n*oste*r siue desiderij feruor (15) hoc su*m*-moueat[3] siue faties ueritatis aut morari ia*m*[4] creditur[5] (16) aut retrocedere supputatu*r*[6], q*uasi* Iosue denuo u*el* Amos fili*us* i*m*pera-(17)-ret i*n* certitudine[7] dubitare *com*pellimu*r* *et* i*n* uoce*m* *pre*cursoris i*rrum*pere[8] (18) sic tu es qui ue*n*turus es an aliu*m* expectamu*s*? Et q*uam*uis lo*n*ga (19) sitis i*n* dubiu*m* que sunt[9] certa p*r*opter esse *pro*-pinqua ut assolet fu-(20)-ribunda deflectat nichilomin*us* *in* te credim*us* et speramus asse-(21)-uerantes te ministru*m*[10] et eccle*s*ie filiu*m* et romane glorie p*r*omoto-(22)-rem. Nam et[11] ego qui scribo ta*m* *pro* me qua*m* *pro* alijs uelut[12] decet (23) Impe*r*atoria*m* maiestate*m* benignis-simu*m* uidi et clementissimu*m* te (24) audiuj cu*m* pedes tuos manu*s* mee tractaru*nt* *et* labia mea debi-(25)-tum p*er*soluerun*t* tu*nc*[13] exultauit i*n* me[14] sp*iritus* meus cu*m*[15] tacitus di-(26)-xi mecu*m* ecce Agnus dej ecce qui tollit[16] pecata mu*n*di.

[§ 3.] *Sed* q*uid*[17] ta*m* (27) sera moretur segnities admiramur q*uando*[18] ia*m* dudu*m* *in* Valle uictor (28) heridanj no*n* secus[19] tusci*am* derelinquis[20] p*re*termittis *et* negligis (29) q*uam* si[21] iura tutanda[22] Imp*er*ij circu*m*scribi ligaru*m*[23] finibus arbitreris no*n* (30) p*r*orsus ut suspicamur adu*er*tens q*uoni*am romanor*um* gloriosa pote*s*tas[24] (31) nec metis italie nec tricornis[25]

[1] W.F[1]. *quasi*; Cod. Ven. T.F[2].G.O. *ceu*.
[2] Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. *praecipitatus*; T.F[2].O. *peroptatus*; G. *praeoptatus*; D.B.M. *molto desiderato*.
[3] W.—O. *submoneat*; Cod. Ven. *submoueat*; D.B. *ammonisca*; M. *monisca*.
[4] W.F[1]. *morari te jam*; Cod. Ven. T.F[2].G.O. *morari jam*.
[5] W.F[1]. *credunt*; Cod. Ven. T.F[2].G.O. *creditur*.
[6] W.F[1]. *supputant*; Cod. Ven. T.F[2].O. *supputatur*; G. *suspicatur*; D.B.M. *pensasi*.
[7] Cod. Ven. W.F[1].F[2].G.O. *imperaret incertitudine*; T. *imperaret in certitudine*; D.B.M. *nella certitudine*.
[8] W.F[1]. *erumpere*; Cod. Ven. T.F[2].G.O. *irrumpere*.
[9] F[1]. *erant*; B.M. *erano*; D. *sono*; Cod. Ven. *sunt*; W. prefers *erant*, but adheres to the MS. reading in his text.
[10] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *te Dei ministrum*; D.B.M. *te essere ministro di Dio*.
[11] T. omits *Nam*. [12] W. *ut*; F[1]. *veluti*; Cod. Ven. *uel*; T.F[2].G.O. *velut*.
[13] Cod. Ven. *cum*; W.F[1]. *quum*; D.B.M. *quando*; T.F[2].G.O. *tunc*.
[14] F[1].F[2].G.O. *in te*; Cod. Ven. W.T. *in me*; D.B.M. *in me*.
[15] T.F[2].G.O. *et*; Cod. Ven. *cum*; W.F[1]. *quum*; D.M. *quando*; B. omits.
[16] T.F[2].O. *abstulit*; Cod. Ven. W.F[1].G.D.M. *tollit*; B. omits.
[17] F[1]. *quia*; T. *quae*; Cod. Ven. W.F[2].G.O. *quid*.
[18] Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. *quando*; D.B.M. *quando*; T.F[2].G.O. *quoniam*.
[19] W.F[1]. omit *non secus*, which are in Cod. Ven.; D.B.M. *non lungi*.
[20] W.F[1]. *derelinquens*; Cod. Ven. T.F[2].G.O. *derelinquis*.
[21] W.F[1]. *quasi*; Cod. Ven. T.F[2].G.O. *quam si*.
[22] Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. *tuendi*; T.F[2].G.O. *tutanda*.
[23] W.F[1]. *Liguriae*; Cod. Ven. T.F[2].G.O. *Ligurum*.
[24] W.—O. *Romanorum potestas*; Cod. Ven. *R. gloriosa p.*; D.B.M. *la gloriosa signoria de' Romani*.
[25] Cod. Ven. *iriconis*.

europe margine coartatur[1]. (32) nam *et*si ui*m* passa no*n* Augustum[2] gubernacula sua co*n*traxe*r*it[3] un-(33)-diq*ue* *tame*n de *i*nuiolabilj iure fluctus amphitritis[4] attigens[5] uix (34) ab *i*nutilj unda occeanj se circu*m*cingi dignatu*r*. scriptu*m* ete*n*im (35) uobis est nascetur[6] pulcra troianus origine cesar Impe*r*ium (36) occeano fama*m* qui terminet astris. Et cu*m* uniuersaliter (37) orbem describi edixisset. Augustus ut bos no*ste*r euua*n*ge-(38)-lizans accensus ignis eternj flama[7] remugit si no*n* de iu-(39)-stissimj p*r*incipatus aula p*ro*diisset[8] edictu*m* unigenitus dej filiu*s* (40) h*o*mo factus[9] ad p*ro*fitendu*m*[10] secu*n*du*m* natu*r*am assu*m*ptam edicto[11] se subditu*m* (41) nequaqu*am*[12] tu*n*c nasci de uirgine uoluisset. No*n* e*n*im suasisset *i*niustu*m* (42) que*m* omne*m* iustitia*m* i*m*plere decebat[13].

[§ 4.] Pudeat itaq*ue* in angu-(43)-stissima[14] mu*n*di area irretirj[15] ta*m* diu q*uem* mundus o*m*nis expectat [fol. 56vo] et ab Augusti[16] circu*m*spect*i*one no*n* defluat q*uod* Tuscana tira*n*nis *i*n dilat*i*onis (2) fidutia confortatur et[17] cotidie malign*an*tiu*m* cohortando[18] sup*er*bia*m* uir-(3)-es nouas accumulat temeritate*m* temeritati adijciens. Intonet ite-(4)-ru*m*[19] uox illa Curionis *i*n Cesare*m* du*m* trepida*n*t nullo firmate[20] ro-(5)-bore pa*r*tes tolle moras semp*er*[21] nocuit differe pa*r*atis. par labor atque (6) metus[22] p*re*tio maiore petu*n*tur. Intonet illa uox *i*ncrepitantis a nubis (7) iteru*m* in Eneam[23]. Si te nulla mouet tantaru*m* gloria re*r*u*m*. nec sup*er* (8) ipse tua molitis[24] laude labore*m*. Ascaniu*m* surgentem

[1] Cod. Ven. *cohartatur*. W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives *cohartant* as the reading of Cod. Ven.

[2] W.F^1.F^2.G.O. *passa in angustum*; Cod. Ven. *p. in Augustum*; T. *p. non Augustum*.

[3] Cod. Ven. W.F^1. *contraxit*; T.F^2.G.O. *contraxerit*; D. *contrahera*; M. *contraera*; B. *contradia*.

[4] W.F^1. *Amphitrites*; T.F^2.G.O. *Amphitritis*; Cod. Ven. *Amphitricis*; D.M. *del Mare Amphitrito il quale è in Grecia* (!).

[5] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *attingens*.

[6] Cod. Ven. W.F^1. *Scriptum est enim n.*; T.F^2.G.O. *Scriptum etenim nobis est n.*

[7] Cod. Ven. W.F^1.T. *a. ignis flamma*; F^2.G.O. *a. ignis aeterni f.*; D.B.M. *la fiamma dello eterno fuoco*.

[8] D.B.M. *avesse aperto*, which, as W. observes, looks as if the translator had had *prodidisset* in his Latin original.

[9] Cod. Ven. *homo factus qui*; W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives *qui homo factus* as the reading of Cod. Ven.

[10] Cod. Ven. *proficendum*.

[11] Cod. Ven. *edicit*.

[12] W.F^1. *nequaquam tum*; Cod. Ven. *nequaquam tunc*; T.F^2.G.O. *nunquam tunc*; D.B.M. *non...allora*.

[13] Cod. Ven. W.F^1. *qui o. j. i. debebat*; T.F^2.G.O. *quem o. j. i. decebat*.

[14] Cod. Ven. W.F^1. *angusta*; T.F^2.G.O. *angustissima*; D.B.M. *strettissima*.

[15] Cod. Ven. *metiri*.

[16] Cod. Ven. W.F^1. *Augusta*; T.F^2.G.O. *Augusti*.

[17] Cod. Ven. *ut*.

[18] Cod. Ven. *cohartando*.

[19] Cod. Ven. W.F^1. *igitur*; T.F^2.G.O. *iterum*; D. *dunque*; B. *dunque ancora*; M. *adunque*.

[20] Cod. Ven. *firmari*.

[21] Cod. Ven. *nocuit semper*.

[22] Cod. Ven. *metas*.

[23] W.F^1. *a nubibus Aeneam*; Cod. Ven. *Annubis in Eneam*; T.G. *Anubis iterum in Aeneam*; F^2.O. *a nubibus iterum in Aeneam*; D.B.M. *quella voce discesa da cielo....*

[24] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *moliris*.

et spes heredis Iulj. (9) Respice cuj regimen[1] ytalie romanaque regna[2] debentur.

[§ 5.] Iohannes namque (10) regius primogenitus tuus *et* rex quem post diei orientis occasum (11) mundi successiua posteritas prestolatur[3] nobis est alter Ascanius (12) qui uestigia magnj genitoris obseruans in turnos ubique sicut leo (13) deseuiet et in latinos[4] uelut agnos[5] mitescet. Precaueant sa-(14)-cratissimj Regis alta consilia ne celeste iuditium samuelis illa uerba (15) reasperet[6] nonne cum paruulus esset in occulis[7] tuis caput in tribubus[8] israel (16) factus es? unxit que te dominus in Regem super israel *et*[9] misit te deus in (17) uia[10] *et* ait uade *et* interfice peccatores amalech? Nam *et* tu in (18) Regem sacratus es ut amalech percuciens ut[11] agag non parcas[12] at-(19)-que ulciscaris illum qui misit te de gente[13] brutalj *et* de festina[14] (20) sua solennitate que quidem *et* amalech *et* agag sonare[15] dicuntur[16].

[§ 6.] (21) Tu Mediolanj tam uernando quam hiemando moraris *et* ydram pe-(22)-stiferam per capitum amputationem reris extinguere quia si[17] ma-(23)-gnalia gloriosi alcide[18] recensuisses te ut illum falli cognoscerés cui (24) pestilens animal capite repullulante[19] multiplici per dannum[20] cresce-(25)-bat donec instanter magnanimus[21] uite principium

[1] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *regnum.* [2] F².G.O.D.B.M. *tellus*; Cod. Ven. W.F¹. *regna.*
[3] Cod. Ven. *prosteritas prestoletur.* [4] Cod. Ven. *latino.*
[5] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *agnus*; D.B.M. *siccome agnello.*
[6] G. *reasperent*; Cod. Ven. W.F¹.T.F².O. *reasperet.*
[7] W.F¹.T. *esses oculis*; Cod. Ven. F².G.O. *esses in oculis.*
[8] Cod. Ven. *tribus.*
[9] W.F¹. *unxitque Dominus in regem et*; Cod. Ven. *unxitque deus in regem et*; T. *unxitque te Dominus in regem et*; F².G.O. *unxitque te Dominus in regem super Israel et*; D. *et il Signore unse il re et*; B. *e te il Signore unse in Re*; M. *e il Signore unse te re.*
[10] Cod. Ven. *viam.* [11] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *percutias et.*
[12] Cod. Ven. W.F¹. *Agagi parcas minime*; T.F².G.O. *Agag non parcas*; D.B.M. *non perdoni.*
[13] Cod. Ven. *de gente in gentem.*
[14] T. *festiva*; Cod. Ven. W.F¹.F².G.O. *festina*; D.B.M. *affrettata.*
[15] Cod. Ven. *Agagi sonare*; W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives *sanare* as the reading of Cod. Ven.; B. *Agagi...sanarsi.*
[16] W.F¹. omit *que quidem...dicuntur*; B. *le quali cittadi Amalec et Agagi dicono sanarsi*; D.M. omit. W., who misread the reading of his MS., omitted this sentence apparently as being a gloss and unintelligible; but it is essential as an interpretation of Dante's use of the phrases 'de gente brutali et de festina sua sollemnitate' in the previous sentence, where he plays upon the meaning of the names Amalech and Agag. In the *Explanatio nominum*, which accompanies many MSS. of the Vulgate of Cent. XIII and Cent. XIV, Amalech, as Mr Wicksteed has kindly informed me, is explained as 'gens bruta' or 'gens brutalis,' and Agag as 'festina (*var.* festiva) solemnitas.'
[17] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *quod si.*
[18] W.F¹. *m. gloriosa Alcides*; Cod. Ven. *m. gloriose Alcidę*; D.B.M. *le magnifiche cose fatte gloriosamente da Alcide*; T.F².G.O. *m. gloriosi Alcidae.*
[19] W.F¹. *repullulans*; Cod. Ven. *repupulare*; T.F².G.O. *repullulante.*
[20] T.F².G.O. *in damnum*; Cod. Ven. W.F¹. *per damnum*; D.B.M. *per danno.*
[21] W.F¹. *donec magnanimus*; Cod. Ven. T.F².G.O. *donec instanter m.*; D. *attanto che... constantemente*; B.M. *a tanto che...instantemente.*

*im*petiuit[1] non *et*-(26)-*enim*[2] ad arbores extirpandas ualet ipsa ramor*um*[3] incisio quin[4] iter*um*[5] (27) multiplicius uirulenter[6] ramificen*t*[7] quousq*ue* radices *in*columes fue-(28)-rint ut *pr*ebeant alimentu*m* quid *pr*eses unice mu*n*dj *pe*regisse[8] *pr*econi-(29)-cis[9] cu*m* cervice*m* cremone deflexe*r*is co*n*tumacis? nonne tun*c*[10] ue*l*[11] Bri-(30)-sie ue*l* Papie rabies *in*opina[12] turgescet i*m*mo. que cu*m* *etiam*[13] flagella-(31)-ta[14] resederit mox alia uercellis ue*l* *pe*rgamj ue*l* alibj retu*r*gebit do-(32)-nec h*uius* scatascentie cau*s*a radicalis[15] tollatur *et*[16] radice ta*n*ti erroris (33) auulsa cu*m* trunco ramj pu*n*gitiuj[17] arescan*t*.

[§ 7.] An ignoras[18] excelle*n*-(34)-tissiue[19] p*r*incipu*m* nec de specula su*mm*e celsitudinis dep*r*ehendis ubj (35) vulpecula fetoris istius uenantiu*m* secura decu*m*bat[20]? Quippe nec (36) pado p*r*ecipiti nec tiberj tuo criminosa potat*ur*[21]. ve*r*um Sarnj fluenta (37) to*r*rentis adhuc rict*us* eius[22] *in*fitiu*n*t *et* florentia[23] forte nescis dira (38) hec pe*r*nities nu*n*cupatur. Hec est uipe*r*a uersa in uiscera genitricis. (39) Hec est[24] languida pecus gregem d*om*inj suj sua *con*tagione *com*maculan*s*[25]. [fol. 57ro] Hec mi*r*ra scelestis[26] *et* *im*pia *in* Cinare patris amplex*us* exestuans[27] (2) hec amata illa *im*patiens q*ue* repulso fatalj *con*nubio

[1] W.F[1]. *amputavit*; Cod. Ven. *impetivit*; T.F[2].G.O. *impedivit*; D.B.M. *taglió*; W. erroneously in his *apparatus criticus* gives *impertivit* as the reading of Cod. Ven.

[2] Cod. Ven. W.F[1].T. *enim*; F[2].G.O. *etenim*.

[3] Cod. Ven. *Romanorum*.

[4] W.F[1]. *quia*; T. *qui*; Cod. Ven. F[2].G.O. *quin*.

[5] G. *immo*; Cod. Ven. W.F[1].T.F[2].O. *iterum*; D.B.M. *ancora*.

[6] Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. *via terrae*; D.B.M. *essendo verdi*; T.F[2].G.O. *virulenter*.

[7] Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. *ramescent*; T.F[2].O. *ramificent*; G. *ramificant*.

[8] W.F[1]. *Qui praees unice mundo quid peregisse*; Cod. Ven. *Qui praees unice mundi peregisse*; T.F[2].G.O. *quid praeses unice mundi p.*; in a note W. proposes a conjectural emendation (as an alternative to that adopted in his text), which is the reading of our MS.

[9] W.F[1]. *praeconiaberis*; Cod. Ven. *praeconiis*; T.G. *praeconjicis*; F[2].O. *praeconizabis*; D. *che te...chiameranno*; B. *che...annunzierai tu aver fatto*; M. *che...annunzierai tu che avrai fatto*.

[10] Cod. Ven. *nonne ut tuo*.

[11] Cod. Ven. *uel tu*.

[12] In the MS. between *rabies* and *inopina* is *u* cancelled.

[13] W.F[1]. *quum*; Cod. Ven. *cum etiam*; T.F[2].G.O. *quum etiam*; W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives *quum et* as the reading of Cod. Ven.

[14] Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. *flagellum*; T.F[2].G.O. *flagellata*; D.B.M. *flagellata*.

[15] Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. *donec hujusmodi rabies*; D.B.M. *la radicevole* (B. *radichevole*; M. *radicale*) *cagione di questo pizzicore*; T.F[2].G.O. *donec hujus scatescentiae causa radicalis*.

[16] W. conjecturally inserts *et*, which is omitted by Cod. Ven.

[17] W.F[1]. *pungentes*; Cod. Ven. *pugitivi*; D.B.M. *pungenti*; T.F[2].G.O. *pungitivi*; W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives *pugitiens* as the reading of Cod. Ven.

[18] D.B.M. *Signore*, which, as W. observes, points to a barbarous *Signor es* in the original.

[19] *Sic*, for *excellentissime*.

[20] Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. *recumbat*; T.F[2].G.O. *decumbat*.

[21] W.F[1].T. *potat*; Cod. Ven. *potant*; F[2].G.O. *potatur*.

[22] W.F[1]. *vitia sua*; D.B.M. *li suoi inganni*; Cod. Ven. T.F[2].G.O. *rictus ejus*; W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives *victus es* as the reading of Cod. Ven.

[23] Cod. Ven. *Florentiam*.

[24] Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. omit *est*.

[25] Cod. Ven. W.F[1].T. *pecus quae g. d. s. s. c. commaculat*; F[2].G.O. *pecus g. d. s. s. c. commaculans*.

[26] T.F[2].G.O. *scelesta*; Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. *scelestis*.

[27] Cod. Ven. *in Cinere posita a. e.*; D.B.M. *la quale s' infiamma nel fuoco degli abbraciamenti del padre*.

quem fata[1] ne-(3)-gabant generum[2] sibi ascire non timuit sed in bella furialiter prouo-(4)-cauit[3] et demum male ausa luendo laqueo se suspendit. Ve-(5)-re matrem uiperea feritate dilaniare contendit[4] dum contra Romam (6) cornua rebellionis exacuit que ad imaginem suam atque simi-(7)-litudinem fecit illam. Vere fumos[5] euaporante[6] sanie ui-(8)-tiantes exalat et inde uicine[7] pecudes et inscie[8] contabescunt (9) dum falsis illiciendo[9] blanditijs et figimentis[10] agregat sibi fini-(10)-timos et infatuat[11] agregatos. Vere in paternos ardet ipsa (11) concubitus[12] dum improba procacitate conatur summj pontificis[13] qui (12) pater est patrum aduersum[14] te uiolare ascensum[15]. Vere dej (13) ordinationi resistit[16] proprie uoluntatis[17] ydolum uenerando dum re-(14)-gem aspernata ligitimum[18] non erubescit insana regi non suo (15) iura non sua pro male agenda[19] potestate pacisci. sed atendat[20] (16) ad laqueum mulier furiata quo se innectit[21]. Nam sepe quis in re-(17)-probum sensum traditur ut traditus fatiat ea que non conueniunt[22] (18) que quamuis iusta[23] sint opera iusta tamen supplicia esse noscuntur.

[§ 8.] (19) Eya itaque rumpe moras proles altera[24] ysai summe[25] tibi fiduti-(20)-am de occulis dominj dej[26] Sabaoth coram quo agis et Goliam hunc (21) in funda sapientie tue[27] atque in lapide uirium tuarum

[1] W.F[1]. *quem sortes*; Cod. Ven. *quem semper*; T.F[2].G.O. *quem fata.*

[2] So Cod. Ven., the reading of which W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives as *generem.*

[3] W.F[1]. *sed furialiter in bellum vocavit*; Cod. Ven. T. *sed f. in bella vocavit*; F[2].G.O. *sed in bella f. provocavit*; W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives the reading of Cod. Ven. as *in bello.*

[4] There is a hiatus in Cod. Ven. between *ausa* and *dum contra*; W.F[1]. insert conjecturally (from the Italian) *debitumque solvens, laqueo se suspendit. Vere viperina feritate matrem lacerare ausa*; T. *luendo laqueo se suspendit. Verè viperina feritate matrem laniare contendit*; F[2].G.O. *l. l. s. s. V. matrem viperea feritate dilaniare c.*; D.B.M. *pagando il debito con un laccio s' impiccò. Veramente con ferità di vipera si sforza di squarciar la madre.*

[5] Cod. Ven. *fumo.*

[6] Cod. Ven. *euaporantes*; in MS. between *fumos* and *euaporante* is *es* cancelled.

[7] W.F[1]. *viciniae*; Cod. Ven. *uicinie*; D.B.M. *vicine*; T.F[2].G.O. *vicinae.*

[8] W.F[1]. *exterae*; Cod. Ven. *uiscie*; D. *simplici*; B.M. *strane*; T.F[2].G.O. *insciae.*

[9] W.—O. *alliciendo*; Cod. Ven. *aliciendo.*

[10] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *figmentis.*

[11] W.F[1]. *insanescit*; Cod. Ven. *insinuat*; T.F[2].G.O. *infatuat*; D.B.M. *fa impazzare.*

[12] W.F[1]. *paternos incensa concubitus*; Cod. Ven. *p. ipsa c.*; T.F[2].G.O. *p. ardet ipsa c.*

[13] Cod. Ven. *summum pontificem.*

[14] W.—O. *adversus*; Cod. Ven. *aduersum.*

[15] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *assensum.*

[16] Cod. Ven. *restitit.*

[17] Cod. Ven. *voluntati.*

[18] W.—O. *legitimum.*

[19] W.F[1]. *agendi*; Cod. Ven. *agende*; T.F[2].G.O. *agenda.*

[20] W.F[1].F[2].O. *attendit*; Cod. Ven. *accendit*; T.G. *attendat*; D.B.M. *attende.*

[21] T.F[2].G.O. *innectat*; Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. *innectit*; D.B.M. *si lega.*

[22] Cod. Ven. *etiam conveniunt*; W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives *conuenienti* as the reading of Cod. Ven.

[23] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *injusta*; D.B.M. *ingiuste.*

[24] Cod. Ven. W.F[1].T.F[2].O[1].O[2]. *alta*; D.B.M. *alta*; G.O[3]. *altera.*

[25] See note on *Epist.* VI, fol. 58[ro], l. 26.

[26] F[1]. omits *dei.*

[27] Cod. Ven. *sue*; B.M. *tua*; D. omits.

*pro*sterne quoni*am* (22) *in* eius occasu nox[1] et umbra timoris castra filistino*rum*[2] oper*i*et (23) fugient filistej *et* liberabit*ur* isra*e*l. tu*n*c here*d*itas no*s*tra qua*m* sine (24) intermisione deflem*us* ablata*m* nobis erit *in* integr*um* restituta. (25) At que*m* admod*um*[3] sacroso*n*cte Ieru*s*alem memores exules *in* babillone (26) gemiscim*us* ita tu*n*c ciues *et* respiran*t*es *in* pace[4] *con*fusionis mi-(27)-serias[5] *in* gaudio recolemus[6].

Proposed emendations in the Oxford text of Epist. VII.

Title. *For* Aligherius, *read* Alagherii[7].
For osculantur pedes, *read* (*with Cod. Ven.*) osculum ante pedes[8].
l. 19. *For* peroptatus, *read* (*with MS.*) praeoptatus.
l. 44. *For* in te...et tacitus, *read* (*with MS. and Cod. Ven.*) in me... quum tacitus.
l. 46. *For* abstulit, *read* (*with MS. and Cod. Ven.*) tollit[9].
l. 48. *For* quoniam, *read* (*with MS. and Cod. Ven.*) quando.
l. 54. *For* Romanorum potestas, *read* (*with MS. and Cod. Ven.*) Romanorum gloriosa potestas[10].

[1] Cod. Ven. *nos*; W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives *mos* as the reading of Cod. Ven.

[2] W.F[1]. *Filisteorum*; Cod. Ven. *phylistinorum*; T.F[2].G.O. *Filistinorum*; D.B.M. *Filistei*.

[3] W.F[1]. *At quidem, ad modum quo nunc* (the last two words are not in Cod. Ven., but were inserted conjecturally by W.); T.F[2].G.O. *Ac quemadmodum*.

[4] So Cod. Ven.; W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives the reading of Cod. Ven. as *pacem*.

[5] Cod. Ven. *miserius*.

[6] W.F[1]. *revolvemus*; Cod. Ven. *reuelemur*; D.B.M. *rivolgeremo*; T.F[2].G.O. *recolemus*.— In Cod. Ven. the letter is dated:—*Scriptum in Tuscia sub fonte Sarni XV Kalendas Maias, divi Henrici faustissimi cursus ad Italiam anno primo.* W. prints *fontem* for *fonte*; and *XI* for *XV*. F[1].T.F[2].G.O. give the date as *XIV Kal. Maias MCCCXI*. In D.B.M. it is as follows: *Scritto in Toscana sotto la fonte d' Arno a di XVI del Mese d' Aprile MCCCXI, nell' Anno primo del coronamento d' Italia dello Splendidissimo et honoratissimo Arrigo.* (For the meaningless *coronamento d' Italia* W. reads after a Roman MS. *corrimento ad Italia*; the same MS. instead of *splendidissimo et onoratissimo Arrigo*, reads *divino e felicissimo Arrigo*.)

[7] The title of the letter is not in the MS.; it is supplied from the Venetian MS. by Witte, Torri and others. *Dantes Alagherii* is the recognized Latinized form of Dante's name (cf. *Epist.* VI tit. and *Quaestio de Aqua et Terra*, proem.).

[8] 'Osculum ante pedes' ('mittit' or 'dat'), was one of the common formulae used in addressing personages of exalted rank; cf. the similar 'officium ante pedes' in the title of the second letter addressed by the Countess of Battifolle to the Empress (see below, p. 20).

[9] *Tollit* is also the word in the Vulgate (*John* I, 29). It is difficult to account for the substitution of *abstulit* by the editors; possibly it was induced by a recollection of *Rom.* XI, 27: 'cum abstulero peccata eorum.'

[10] Dante several times elsewhere uses the epithet *gloriosus* of Rome and Romans; cf. *Mon.* II, 11, l. 65: 'gloriosum populum Romanum' (also, II, 2, l. 70; 5, l. 37); *Conv.* IV, 5, l. 52: 'gloriosa Roma'; *Conv.* IV, 6, l. 95: 'glorioso Catone': *Conv.* IV, 6, l. 113: 'glorioso Torquato'; cf. also *Purg.* X, 73: 'l' alta gloria del Roman principato'; and *Mon.* II, 3, l. 30: 'gloriosum regem Aeneam' (Aeneas being regarded by Dante as the founder of the Roman Empire).

l. 71. *For* nunquam, *read* (*with MS. and Cod. Ven.*) nequaquam[1].
l. 86. *For* a nubibus, *read* (*with MS. and Cod. Ven.*) Anubis[2].
l. 119. *For* in damnum, *read* (*with MS. and Cod. Ven.*) per damnum[3].
l. 121. *For* impedivit, *read* (*with MS. and Cod. Ven.*) impetivit.
l. 126. *For* praeconizabis, *read* (*with MS.*) praeconicis[4] (praeconjicis).
l. 146. *For* scelesta, *read* (*with MS. and Cod. Ven.*) scelestis[5].
l. 171. *For* innectat, *read* (*with MS. and Cod. Ven.*) innectit.
Colophon. *For* sub fontem, *read* (*with Cod. Ven.*) sub fonte.
Omit MCCCXI (*which is not in Cod. Ven.*).

§ III.

Epistola VI (*To the Florentines*).

This letter, like the preceding, is one of those mentioned by Villani[6]. It was evidently known to Leonardo Bruni (1369–1444), who in his *Vita di Dante* says that when the Emperor Henry VII came into Italy Dante, 'levatosi coll' animo altiero, cominciò a dir male di quelli che reggevano la terra[7], appellandoli scellerati e cattivi, e minacciando loro la debita vendetta per la potenza dell' imperadore, contro la quale diceva esser manifesto ch' essi non avrebbon potuto avere scampo

[1] Cf. *De Monarchia*, II, 12, ll. 41—6: 'Christus, ut scriba ejus Lucas testatur, sub edicto Romanae auctoritatis nasci voluit de Virgine Matre, ut in illa singulari generis humani descriptione Filius Dei, homo factus, homo conscriberetur.'

[2] The substitution by W. and others of *a nubibus* for the MS. reading *Anubis* cannot be justified. *A nubibus* does not fit the facts of the case, for the message of Mercury to Aeneas was not delivered 'from the clouds,' but after Mercury had alighted amid the 'magalia' of Carthage (see *Aen.* IV, 259 ff.). Further, if *a nubibus* was the original reading it is difficult to conceive a scribe substituting the unfamiliar *Anubis*, which is found in both MSS.; the former is manifestly a 'facilior lectio.' The identification of Anubis with Mercury was well-known in the Middle Ages. It is mentioned by Servius in his commentary on *Aen.* VIII, 698, and hence no doubt found its way into the *Elementarium Doctrinae Rudimentum* of Papias, the *Magnae Derivationes* of Uguccione da Pisa, and the *Catholicon* of Giovanni da Genova. Uguccione, with whose work, as I have shown elsewhere (see *Dante Studies and Researches*, pp. 97 ff.), Dante was familiar, says: '*Nubes* componitur cum *a*, quod est *sine*: et dicitur *hic anubis*, idest mercurius, quasi *sine nube*: est enim deus sermonis quia omnia revelat; et idem dicitur *cinocephalus*, a *cinos* quod est *canis*, et *cephas caput*, quia cum canino capite depingitur apud egypticos propter sagacitatem; est enim canis animal valde sagax; et producit *nu*, sicut nubes; unde Virgilius: Omnigenumque deum monstra et latrator anubis.'

[3] The MS. reading *per damnum* is obviously preferable; the allusion, of course, being to the fact that for every head cut off from the hydra two new ones sprang up in its place.

[4] The *praeconiis* of Cod. Ven. points also to this reading. 'Quid peregisse praeconicis quum, &c.?' 'What do you suppose you will have accomplished when you have crushed Cremona?'

[5] *Scelestis* is a recognised mediaeval form. Papias in his *Elementarium Doctrinae Rudimentum* (written circ. 1060) says: '*scelestus* et *scelestis* dicitur'; and Giovanni da Genova in his *Catholicon* (completed in 1286) has: '*Scelus*, *sceleris*...unde *scelestus -sta -stum*...dicitur etiam *hic* et *haec scelestis* et *hoc -ste*.'

[6] See above, p. 4.

[7] That is, Florence.

alcuno[1].' It was also known independently to another early biographer of Dante, Giannozzo Manetti (1396—1459), who in his *Vita Dantis*, in the same connection, writes: 'Dantes quoque se ulterius continere non potuit, quin spe plenus epistolam quamdam ad Florentinos, ut ipse vocat, intrinsecos contumeliosam sane scriberet, in qua eos acerbissime insectatur[2].'

Like *Epistolae* I, II, and III, and the three so-called Battifolle letters, this letter, so far as is known, is preserved in the Vatican MS. alone. Extracts from it, in German, were printed by Witte in 1838 in *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*[3]. The Latin text was first printed by Torri in 1842, in his edition of Dante's letters, and was reprinted, with emendations, in the editions of Fraticelli and Giuliani, and in the Oxford Dante[4].

In the *apparatus criticus* T. = Torri; F. = Fraticelli; G. = Giuliani; O. = Oxford Dante.

In the MS. there is no break between the end of *Epist.* VII and the beginning of *Epist.* VI, the title of which, commencing in the middle of l. 27 of fol. 57ro, follows on continuously with the text (and colophon) to the middle of l. 28 of fol. 58vo.

Dantes alagh*erii*[5] florentin*us* (28) et exul
im*m*eritus scelestissimis[6] florentinis *intrin*secis[7].

[§ 1.] Et*er*-(29)-nj pia p*rou*identia regis q*ui* du*m* celestia sua bonitate p*er*petu-(30)-at *in*fera *nost*ra despiciendo no*n* dese*r*it sacrosancto Romanor*um* i*m*pe-(31)-rio res hu*m*anas disposuit gubernandas. ut sub tanti se-(32)-renitate[8] p*re*sidij genus mortale quiesce*re*t *et* ubiq*ue* n*atur*a poscen-(33)-te ciuiliter degeret*ur*. Hoc et si diuinis *comprob*at*ur* elogijs[9] (34) hoc *et* si solius podio rationis inixa *con*testatur antiquitas (35) no*n* leuiter t*amen* veritati applaudit s*ed*[10] solio

[1] *Vita di Dante*, ed. Brunone Bianchi, 1883, p. xxi. The references to the title of the letter ('scelestissimis Florentinis'), and to the threats of the Emperor's vengeance and to the hopelessness of resistance (§§ 3—5), are unmistakable.

[2] See *Philippi Villani Liber de Civitatis Florentiae Famosis Civibus*, etc., Florence, 1847, pp. 77—8. Here again the reference (independent of that of Bruni) to the title of the letter ('Florentinis intrinsecis') is unmistakable. It has been shown by Zenatti that this very MS. was once in the possession of Manetti (see above, p. 1).

[3] In the article, *Neu aufgefundene Briefe des Dante Allighieri* (see above, p. 1, n. 1).

[4] See above, p. 5.

[5] T.F.G. *Allagherius*; O. *Alighierius*.

[6] Between this and the previous word is *se* cancelled.

[7] T.G. *intrinsecus*; F.O. *intrinsecis*.

[8] G. *securitate*; T.F.O. *serenitate*; G. says: 'potendosi dal codice ritrarre *securitate*, ho prescelto questo vocabolo che parmi più confacevole al proprosito'; but the MS. unmistakably reads *serenitate*.

[9] F.G.O. *eloquiis*; T. *elogiis*.

[10] T.F.G.O. *quod*.

augustalj[1] uacan-(36)-te totus orbis exorbitat quod nauclerus et remiges[2] in na-(37)-uicula petrj dormitant et quod ytalia misera sola priuatis arbi-(37)-trijs derelicta omnibusque[3] publico moderamine destituta quanta [fol. 57vo] ventorum fluentuum ue[4] concussione feratur uerba non caperent[5] sed et uix (2) italie[6] infelices lacrimis metiuntur. Igitur in hanc dej manifesti-(3)-ssimam uoluntatem quicumque temere presumendo tumescunt si (4) gladius eius qui dicit mea est ultio de celo non cecidit ex (5) nunc seueri iudicis aduentante iuditio pallore notentur.

[§ 2.] Vos (6) autem diuina iura et humana transgredientes quos dira cupi-(7)-ditatis ingluuies paratos in omne nefas illexit nonne terror (8) secunde[7] mortis exagitat[8]? Ex quo primi et solj iugum libertatis (9) horrentes in Romanj Principis mundj Regis et dej ministrj glo-(10)-riam fremuistis[9]? atque iure prescriptionis[10] utentes debite (11) subiectionis offitium denegando in rebellionis vesaniam maluistis (12) insurgere[11]. An ignoratis amentes et discolj publica iura cum (13) sola temporis terminatione finirj et nullius prescriptionis[12] calculo (14) fore obnoxias[13]? Nempe legum sanctiones[14] alme[15] declarant et humana (15) ratio percuntando[16] decernit publica rerum dominia quantalibet diutur-(16)-nitate[17] neglecta numquam posse uanescere uel abstenuata conque-(17)-ri[18]. Nam quod ad omnium cedit utilitatem sine omnium detrimento (18) interire non potest uel etiam infirmarj, et hoc deus et natura non uult (19) et mortalium penitus abhorreret ascensus[19] quod[20] fatua[21] talj opinione (20) summota tamquam alteri babillonij pium[22] deserentes Imperium noua regna (21) tentatis ut alia sit florentina ciuilitas alia sit Romana[23] (22) cur apostolocice[24] monarchie similiter inuidere non libet[25] ut si (23) delia geminatur in celo geminetur et delius? Atqui si male (24) ausa rependere uobis

[1] T. *augustale*; F.G.O. *augustali.*
[2] Between this and the previous word is *na* expunctuated.
[3] T.F.G.O. *omnique.*
[4] T.F.G.O. *fluctuumque.*
[5] G. *capiunt*; T.F.O. *caperent.*
[6] T.F.G.O. *Itali.*
[7] T. *sedem*; F.G.O. *secundae.*
[8] T.F.G.O. punctuate with comma instead of note of interrogation after *exagitat.*
[9] T.F.G.O. place semi-colon after *fremuistis.*
[10] T. *proscriptionis*; F.G.O. *praescriptionis*; Witte in his extract (*D.-F.* 1, 483) translates by *Verjährung.*
[11] T.F.G.O. place note of interrogation after *insurgere.*
[12] T. *proscriptionis*; F.G.O. *praescriptionis.*
[13] T.F.G.O. *obnoxia.*
[14] T.G. *sanctores*; F.O. *sanctiones.*
[15] T. *aperte*; F.G.O. *altissime.*
[16] G. *perscrutando*; T.F.O. *percunctando.*
[17] MS. *diurturnitate*, the first *r* being expunctuated.
[18] T. *torqueri*; G. *conquidi*; F.O. *conquiri.*
[19] T.F.G.O. *adsensus.*
[20] T.F.G.O. *quid.*
[21] T.G. *fatui*; F.O. *fatua.*
[22] T. *proprium*; F.G.O. *pium.*
[23] T.F.G.O. place note of interrogation after *Romana.*
[24] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *apostolicae.*
[25] T. places note of interrogation, and F.G.O. semicolon, after *libet.*

terrorj non est territet saltin[1] obstinata (25) precordia quod non modo sapientia sed initium eius ad penam culpe uobis (26) ablatum est. Nulla etenim condictio delinquentis formidolosi-(27)-or quam impudenter et sine dei timore quicquid libet agentis. Hac (28) nimirum persepe[2] animaduersione percutitur impius ut moriens obliui-(29)-scatur suj qui dum uiueret oblitus est dej.

[§ 3.] Sin prorsus arrogan-(30)-tia uestra insolens adeo roris altissimj ceu cacumina gelboe (31) uos fecit exortes[3] ut senatus eterni consulto restitisse timori non (32) fuerit nec etiam non timuisse timetis numquid timor ille pernicio-(33)-sus humanus videlicet[4] atque mundanus abesse poterit superbissimj uestrj (34) sanguinis uestreque multum lacrimande rapine ineuitabilj naufra-(35)-gio properante[5]. An septi uallo ridiculo cuiquam defensionj con-(36)-fidetis[6]. o male concordes o mira cupidine cecati quid uallo (37) sepsisse quid propugnaculis et pinnis armasse[7] iuuabit? cum ad-(38)-uolauerit aquila in auro[8] terribilis que nunc pyrenen nunc caucason (39) nunc athlanta superuolans militie celi magis confortata suffla-[fol. 58ro]-mine uasta maria quondam transuolando despexit? quid cum (2) affore stupescetis miserrimj hominum delirantis hesperie domito-(3)-rem? non equidem spes[9] quam frustra sine more fouetis relu-(4)-ctantia ista iuuabitur sed hac abice[10] iusti regis aduentus in-(5)-flamabitur ampius[11] ac indignata misericordia semper concomi-(6)-tans eius exercitum auolabit. Et quo false libertatis trabeam (7) tueri existimatis eo uere seruitutis in ergastula[12] cancidetis[13]. mi-(8)-ro namque dei iuditio quandoque agi credendum est ut unde digna supp-(9)-litia ipius[14] declinare arbitratur unde[15] in ea grauius precipitetur[16] (10) et qui diuine uoluntati reluctatus est et sciens et uolens ei-(11)-dem militet nesciens atque nolens

[§ 4.] uidebitis edifitia uestra (12) non neccessitati prudenter instructa sed delitijs inconsulte mutata (13) que pergama rediuiua non cingunt tam ariete ruere tristes quam (14) igne cremari videbitis plebem circumquaque furentem nunc in contra-(15)-ria pro et contra. Vnde[17] in idem aduersus uos horrenda clamantem (16) quoniam simul[18] Ienuna[19] et timida nescit esse templa quoque spoliata quo-(17)-tidie

Sic; T.F.G.O. *saltem*.
[2] T. *saepe*; F.G.O. *persaepe*.
[3] T. *expertes*; F.G.O. *exsortes*.
[4] T. *humanusque*; F.G.O. *humanus videlicet*.
[5] T.F.G.O. place note of interrogation after *properante*.
[6] F.G.O. *confiditis*; T. *confidetis*.
[7] T.F.G.O. *vos armasse*.
[8] Boehmer (*Dante-Jahrbuch*, I, 396) proposes *in aura* (!).
[9] T. *spe*; F.G.O. *spes*.
[10] T. *hoc objice*; G. *hoc obice*; F.O. *hac obice*.
[11] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *amplius*.
[12] T. *argastula*; F.G.O. *ergastula*.
[13] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *concidetis*.
[14] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *impius*.
[15] T.F.G.O. *inde*.
[16] T. *praecipitet*; F.G.O. *praecipitetur*.
[17] F.G.O. *deinde*; T. *unde*.
[18] T.F.G.O. *simul et*.
[19] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *jejuna*.

matronarum frequentata concursu[1] paruulos que[2] admirantes (18) et inscios peccata patrum luere destinatos uidere pigebit. (19) Et si presaga mens mea non fallitur sic signis ueridicis sicut (20) inexpugnabilibus argumentis instructa prenuntians vrbem diuti-(21)-no[3] merore confectam[4] in manus alienorum tradi finaliter plurima uestri parte (22) seu neci[5] seu captiuitati[6] deperdita[7] perpeirsuri[8] exilium pauci[9] cum fle-(23)-tu cernetis. Vtque breuiter colligam quas tulit calamitates (24) illa ciuitas gloriosa in fide pro libertate saguntum ingnominiose (25) uos eas[10] in perfidia pro seruitude subire neccesse est.

[§ 5.] Nec ab inopina (26) parmensium fortuna summatis[11] audatiam qui malesauda fame urg-(27)-ente murmurantes ininuicem[12] prius moriamur *et in* media arma (28) ruamus in castra cesaris absente Cesare proruperunt nam *et* hij[13] quamquam (29) de uictoria uictoriam sint[14] adepti nichilominus ibi sunt de dolore (30) dolorem memorabiliter consecuti. Sed recensete fulmina federici prioris (31) et mediolanum consulite pariter et spoletum quoniam ipsorum peruersione simul (32) et euersione discussa uiscera uestra nimium dilatata frigescent (33) et corda uestra nimium feruentia contrahentur ha[15] tuscorum uanis-(34)-simj tam natura quam uitio[16] incensati[17]. Quam[18] in noctis tenebris malesa-(35)-ne mentis pedes[19] oberrent ante oculos pennatorum nec perpenditis (36) figuratis[20] ignari. Vident namque uos pennati *et* immaculati in uia (37) quasi stantes in lumine[21] carceris et miserantem quempiam ne forte uos (38) liberet captiuatos *etiam*[22] in compedibus astrictos et manicis propulsan-(39)-tes nec aduertis[23] dominantem

[1] MS. *concocursu*, the medial *co* being expunctuated. [2] T. *quoque*; F.G.O. *que*.
[3] T.G. *diuturno*; F.O. *diutino*. [4] T. *affectam*; F.G.O. *confectam*.
[5] T.F.G.O. *nece*. [6] T.F.G.O. *captivitate*.
[7] T. *disperdita*; F.G.O. *deperdita*. [8] *Sic*; T.F.O. *perpessuri*; G. *perpessuris*.
[9] G. *paucis*. [10] T. omits *eas*.
[11] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *sumatis*. *Sumo* was very often written by medieval scribes (as in MS. above, and in *Epist.* VII, fol. 57ro, l. 19) with double *m*; hence the warning in the *Catholicon*: '*Sumo, -mis, -psi, -mere, -ptum*...scribitur per unum *m*...sed *summo, -as* per duo *m*, unde versus: M. *summare* duplex sibi vult, sed *sumere* simplex.' (See also Rajna's edition of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, p. clxxxix.)
[12] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *invicem*.
[13] T.F.G.O. *hi*; but *hii* was a common medieval form (see Rajna's edition of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, pp. clxxx—clxxxi).
[14] T.F.G.O. *sunt*. [15] T.G.O. *Ah*; F. *Ha*.
[16] T. *tam vitio quam natura*; F.G.O. *tam natura quam vitio*.
[17] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *insensati*. [18] T.F.G.O. *quantum*.
[19] For *pedes*, Novati (*Le Epistole di Dante*, in *Lectura Dantis: Le Opere Minori di Dante*, p. 310) proposes *retes*, thinking that Dante had in mind *Proverbs*, I, 17: 'Frustra jacitur rete ante oculos pennatorum.' But it is difficult to see what sense he would make out of the passage in that case. 'Pedes mentis' may be a somewhat strained metaphor, but an exactly parallel expression occurs in the *De Monarchia* (II, 8, l. 9): 'Quaedam judicia Dei sunt ad quae humana ratio propriis pedibus pertingere potest.'
[20] T.F.G.O. insert *nec* before *figuratis*. [21] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *limine*.
[22] T.F.G.O. *et*. [23] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *advertitis*.

cupidine*m* quia cecj estis uenenoso [fol. 58vo] susurrio[1] blandiente*m* minis frustratorijs cohibente*m* nec no*n* cap-(2)-tiuitate*m*[2] uos i*n* lege peccati ac sacratissimis legib*us* q*ue* iustitie[3] (3) n*atur*alis imitan*tur* imagine*m* parere uetante*m*. obser*uan*tia quar*um* si (4) leta si libera no*n* t*ant*um no*n* ser*u*itus esse pro*batur* quin imo per*s*picaciter[4] intu-(5)-enti liquet[5] ut[6] est ipsa su*m*ma libertas. Na*m* quid aliud (6) hec nisi liber cursus uoluntatis i*n* actu*m* q*uem* suis leges mansue-(7)-tis[7] expediu*nt*? itaq*ue* solis existentibus liberis q*ui* uolun*tar*ie (8) legi obediu*nt* quas[8] uos esse censebitis qui du*m* pretenditis li-(9)-bertatis affectu*m* con*tra* leges uniu*er*sas i*n* legu*m* p*r*incipe*m* *con*spiratis?

[§ 6.] (10) o mise*r*ima Fesulanor*um* propago et iter*um* iam punita[9] barbaries (11) an par*um* timoris p*re*libata incutiu*nt*? omnino uos trem*er*e arbitror (12) uigilantes q*uamquam* spem simuletis i*n* fatie u*er*boq*ue* mendaci atq*ue* (13) i*n* som*p*nijs exp*er*gisci plerum*que* siue pauesce*n*tes i*n*fusa pre*s*agia siue (14) diurna *con*silia recolentes. V*er*um si me*r*ito trepidantes i*n*sanis-(15)-se penitet no*n* dolentes ut i*n* amaritudi*nem* penitentie[10] (16) metus doloris q*ue* riuolj *con*fluan*t* ue*st*ris ani*m*is i*n*figenda super*sunt* q*uod* (17) Romane rei baiulus hic diuus *et* trihumphator henricus (18) no*n* sua priuata se*d* publica mu*n*di co*m*moda sitiens ardua q*uod* no-(19)-bis[11] aggressus est sua[12] sponte penas nos*tr*as p*ar*ticipans tamq*uam* ad (20) ips*um* post chr*ist*um digitu*m* p*r*ophe*t*ye p*r*opheta direxe*r*it esayas cu*m* (21) sp*iri*tu dei reuelante p*re*dixit uere langores nos*tr*os ipse tulit et dolo-(22)-res nos*tr*os ipse portauit. Igit*ur* tem*p*us amarissime penitendi uos (23) tremere[13] p*re*suptor*um*[14] si dissimulare no*n* uultis adesse *con*spicitis *et*[15] (24) sera penitentia hoc amodo[16] uenie genitiua no*n* erit quin[17] po-(25)-tius te*m*pestiue ani*m*aduersionis exordiu*m* *est* e*n*im q*uoni*am peccator p*er*cu-(26)-titur ut sine retractati*one* riuant*ur*[18].

Scripsit[19] p*r*idie kalen*d*as (27) aprileis[20] i*n* finib*us* tuscie sub fonte[21] sarni faustissimj cursus hen-(28)-ricj cesaris ad ytalia*m* anno p*r*imo.

[1] T.F.G.O. *susurro*; but *susurrium* was the medieval form.
[2] T.F.G.O. *captivantem*.
[3] After *iustitie*, at the end of the line, is *n*, which has not been cancelled.
[4] T. *perspicater*.
[5] In MS. before *liquet* is *libet*, which has been expunctuated.
[6] G. omits *ut*.
[7] G. *adsuetis*.
[8] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *quos*.
[9] T.F.G.O. *punica*.
[10] After *penitentie*, at the end of the line, is *met*, which has been cancelled.
[11] T. *arduaque pro nobis*; F.G.O. *ardua quaeque pro nobis*; but read *ardua pro nobis*, the scribe having confused the abbreviations of *quod* and *pro*.
[12] T. *suas*.
[13] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *temere*.
[14] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *praesumptorum*.
[15] T. *At*; F.G.O. *Et*.
[16] F.O. *hoc a modo*; T. *hoc amodo*; G. *non modo*.
[17] T. *quia*; F.G.O. *quin*.
[18] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *revertatur*.
[19] F.G.O. *Scriptum*; T. *Scripsit*.
[20] T. *prid. Kal. Apriles*; F.G.O. *prid. Kal. Aprilis*.
[21] F.G.O. *fontem*; T. *fonte*.

Proposed emendations in the Oxford text of Epist. VI.

Title. *For* Aligherius, *read* (*with MS.*) Alagherii[1].

l. 9. *For* eloquiis, *read* (*with MS.*) elogiis[2].

l. 40. *For* altissime, *read* (*with MS.*) almae[3].

l. 80. *For* vos armasse, *read* (*with MS.*) armasse.

l. 152. *For* susurro, *read* (*with MS.*) susurrio[4].

l. 169. *For* punica, *read* (*with MS.*) punita[5].

l. 183. *For* ardua quaeque pro nobis, *read* ardua pro nobis[6].

l. 196. *For* revertatur, *read* moriatur[7].

Colophon. *For* Aprilis...fontem, *read* (*with MS.*) Apriles[8]...fonte.

§ IV.

Battifolle Letters.

(*Epist.* VIII—X in Torri; *Epist.* I*—III* in Giuliani.)

The three so-called Battifolle[9] letters, addressed by a Countess of Battifolle[10], wife of one of the Conti Giudi, to Margaret of Brabant, wife

[1] See note on title of *Epist.* VII, above.

[2] The substitution of *eloquiis* is quite uncalled for. Papias says: '*Elogium*, titulus cujuslibet rei, proverbium,...eloquium...divinum responsum'; and Giovanni da Genova: '*hoc elogium*, idest proverbium et responsum divinum...et textus carminum...vel deorum mysterium; unde *hic elogius*, versiculus.' Du Cange quotes instances of the use of *elogium* in Cent. XII and XIV in the sense of *testamentum*, in which sense it occurs repeatedly in the Pandects of Justinian. On the other hand the phrase 'divina eloquia' occurs twice (if the printed editions are to be trusted) in the *De Monarchia* (III, 4, l. 88; 10, l. 13; cf. also II, 9, l. 101).

[3] Papias: '*Almus*, sanctus, pulcher, excelsus'; Giovanni da Genova: '*Almus*, idest sanctus, pulcer, nutriens, secundum Rabanum'; the Emperor Louis the Pious is described in an old chronicle quoted by Du Cange as 'Ludovicus Imperator, qui cognominatus est Almus vel Sanctus.' Dante speaks of Rome as 'alma Urbs' (*Epist.* V, tit.); 'alma Roma' (*Inf.* II, 20); synonymously with 'Urbs sancta' (*Mon.* II, 5, l. 106); 'sancta Città' (*Conv.* IV, 5, l. 53). He uses *almo* in a similar sense in *Paradiso* XXIV, 138: 'Poichè l' ardente spirto vi fece almi.'

[4] *Susurrium* was a recognised medieval word. Giovanni da Genova: '*Susurrium* in *susurro*, *-ras* vide'; and under *susurro*: 'unde *hoc susurrium*, *-rii*, murmur, latens locutio'; he quotes as an instance, *Job* IV, 12: 'et quasi furtive suscepit auris mea venas susurrii ejus,' where, however, the modern Vulgate reads *susurri*. Du Cange quotes instances of *susurrium* from St Jerome and St Bernard.

[5] See *Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.* N.S. XIII, 267 n.

[6] The *que* or *quaeque* of the printed editions is not represented in the MS., in which the scribe has confused the very similar abbreviations of *quod* and *pro*.

[7] The MS. *riuantur* is obviously corrupt. Moore proposes *moriatur*, thinking it probable that Dante had in mind the Biblical phrase in the Vulgate, I *Reg.* XIV, 39 (in A.V., I *Sam.*): 'absque retractatione morietur' (the only instance of the word *retractatio* in the Vulgate).

[8] *Kalendas Apriles* should be read with the MS. and Torri, not *Aprilis*; cf. *Kalendas Maias* in the colophon (according to Cod. Ven.) of *Epist.* VII; and *Kalendas Junias* in the colophon of the third (in the MS. order) of the Battifolle letters (*Epist.* VIII, in Torri; *Epist.* I* in Giuliani). For *sub fonte*, cf. the colophon of *Epist.* VII.

[9] The question as to whether these letters were written by Dante or not is left aside as not being within the scope of the present article.

[10] See below, p. 21, n. 5.

of the Emperor Henry VII, have been preserved, so far as is known, in the Vatican MS. alone. They were first printed by Torri in 1842, in his edition of Dante's letters (*Epistolae* VIII—X), and were reprinted by Giuliani (*Epistolae* I*—III*). They are not included in Fraticelli's edition, nor in the Oxford Dante.

In the *apparatus criticus* T. = Torri; G. = Giuliani.

In the MS. there is a blank space before and after each of the letters. In each case the title and text (and in the case of the last, the colophon also) run on continuously. The first letter begins at l. 29 of fol. 58vo, and ends at l. 14 of fol. 59ro. The second begins at l. 15 of fol. 59ro, and ends at l. 32 of the same fol. The third begins at l. 33 of fol. 59ro, and ends at l. 13 of fol. 59vo.

Battifolle Letters—II.

(*Epist.* IX in Torri; *Epist.* II* in Giuliani.)

(29) Gloriosissime atq*ue* clemen*tissime* dom*ine* dom*ine* .M.[1] diuina (30) pr*o*uidentia Romanor*um* Regine et semp*er* Auguste .G.[2] (31) de bat*ifolle*[3] dej et adiuualis magn*ificen*tie gr*at*ia comitissa i*n* Tuscia (32) palatina ta*m* debite q*uam* deuote subiect*ion*is offic*ium* ant*e* pedes.

Gra-(33)-tissima regie benignitatis epist*o*la et meis oculis uisa letanter (34) et manibus fuit asu*m*pta reueren*ter* ut decuit cu*m*q*ue* sign*ifica*-(35)-ta[4] p*er* illam mentis acie*m* penetran*d*o dulcescere*nt* adeo spir*itus*[5] (36) letitantis[6] feruore deuotion*is* incaluit ut nu*m*q*uam* possi*nt* super*a*re [fol. 59ro] oblia[7] nec memoria sine gaudio memorare. na*m* qua*n*ta uel quali*s* ego? ad e-(2)-narrandum[8] michi de sospitate co*n*sortis *et* sua uti*nam* diuturna co*n*iunx (3) fortissima[9] cesaris co*n*descendat[10]? Quipe tanti pondus honoris atq*ue*[11] (4) merita gratulantis neq*ue* dign*it*as postulabat s*ed* nec *etiam*[12] inclinari huma-(5)-nor*um* *in*[13] graduu*m*

[1] T. *Margaritae*; G. *Margaritae, Brabantis.* The use of the initial alone, for the name, in the 'salutatio' of a letter, except in the case of a Pope, was according to rule. In the *Formularius de modo prosandi* of Baumgartenberger (c. 1300) it is laid down: 'Nomen papae ex integro debet poni in salutacione...quod non fit in aliis. In aliis quidem pro persona mittentis seu etiam recipientis prima litera proprii nominis ponitur.' (*apud* Rockinger, *Über Briefsteller und Formelbücher des Mittelalters*, p. 729).

[2] T. *C.*; G. *Catharina.* [3] T.G. *Battifolle.*

[4] MS. *magnificata* corrected to *significata* by the expunctuation of *ma* and the superscription of *si.*

[5] In MS. before *spiritus* is *p* expunctuated.

[6] *Sic*; T.G. *lectitantis.* [7] *Sic*; T.G. *oblivia.*

[8] G. *qualis ego, ut ad e.*; T. *qualis ego? ad e.* [9] T.G. *fortissimi.*

[10] In MS. before *condescendat* is *consi*, which has been expunctuated.

[11] T.G. *neque.* [12] T.G. *sua; nec tam.* [13] T.G. omit *in.*

dedecuit[1] apicem unde uelut a viuo fonte *sancte*[2] ciuilitatis (6) exe*m*pla debent *in*ferioribus emanare. Dignas itaq*ue* p*er*soluere grates no*n* (7) opis est ho*min*is uer*um* ab ho*m*i*n*e alienu*m* esse no*n* reor. *pro* i*n*sufficientie suplemen-(8)-to deu*m* exorare *quandoque*[3] Nu*n*c ideo regnj siderij iustis p*re*cibus atq*ue* pijs aula (9) pulsetur *et* impetret supplicantis affectus quate*nus* mu*n*di gubernator ete*r*nus (10) co*n*descensuj ta*n*to p*re*mia cohequata[4] retribuat *et* ad auspitia Cesaris *et* (11) Auguste dexteram *grat*ie coaiutricis extendat ut qui romanj p*r*incipa-(12)-tus i*m*perio barbaras nati*o*nes et ciues i*n* mortalium tutamenta sube-(13)-git delirantis euj familia*m* sub trihumphis *et* glo*r*ia suj henricj (14) reformet i*n* melius.

Proposed emendations in the text of the second Battifolle letter as printed by Torri (*Epist.* IX) *and Giuliani* (*Epist.* II*).

Title. *For* C. (*Torri*), Catharina (*Giul.*), *read* (*with MS.*) G.[5]

Text. *For* conjunx fortissimi Caesaris, *read* (*with MS.*) conjunx fortissima[6] Caesaris.

For sua; nec tam inclinari, *read* (*with MS.*) sed nec etiam inclinari.

For sacrae civilitatis, *read* (*with MS.*) sanctae civilitatis.

For exorare, *read* (*with MS.*) exorare quandoque.

For praemia eo aequata (*Torri*), *read* (*with MS. and G.*) praemia coaequata.

Battifolle Letters—III.

(*Epist.* X in Torri; *Epist.* III* in Giuliani.)

(15) Serenissime atq*ue* pijssime do*m*ine do*m*ine .M.[7] celestis misera-tio*n*is i*n*tu-(16)-itu Romanor*um* Regine *et* semp*er* Auguste deuotissima sua (17) .G.[8] de batefolle[9] dej et Imp*er*ij[10] g*rat*ia largiente comitissa i*n* tuscia palat*ina* fle-(18)-xis hu*m*iliter genibus reuere*n*tie debitu*m* exibere[11].

[1] T.G. *decuit.* [2] T.G. *sacrae.* [3] T.G. omit *quandoque.*
[4] T. *eo aequata*; G. *coaequata.*
[5] The initial in MS. is undoubtedly G. not C. Ricci (*L' Ultimo Rifugio di Dante*, p. 17) thinks the lady in question may have been Gherardesca di Donoratico, wife of Guido di Simone da Battifolle.
[6] The epithet appears rather empty as applied to the Emperor, 'Caesar et Augustus.'
[7] G. *Margaritae*; T. *M.* [8] T. *C.*; G. *Catharina.*
[9] MS. *battefolle*, with the first *f* expunctuated; T.G. *Battifolle.*
[10] T.G. *Imperatoris.* [11] T.G. *exhibet.*

Regalis epistole documenta (19) gratuita ea qua potui veneratione recepi intellexi[1] deuote. sed cum de prosperitate (20) successuum uestri felicissimj cursus familiariter[2] intimata concepi[3] quanto libens (21) animus concipientis arriserit[4] placet potius commendare silentio tamquam nuntio meliorj (22) non enim uerba significando suffitiunt ubi mens ipsa quasi debria[5] superatur. Itaque (23) supleat regie celsitudinis apprehentio que[6] scribentis humilitas explicare non potest. (24) At quamuis insinuata per literas inefabiliter grata fuerint et iocunda. spes am-(25)-plior tamen et letandi causas accumulat et simul uota iusta confectat spero equidem (26) de celesti prouisione confidens quam numquam[7] falli uel prepediri posse non dubito et (27) que humane ciuilitati de principe singulari prouidit quod exordia uestri regnj (28) felitia semper in melius prosperata procedent sic igitur in presentibus et futuris exul-(29)-tans de[8] Auguste clementia[9] sine ulla hesitatione recurro et suppliciter[10] tem-(30)-pestiua deposco quatenus me sub umbra tutissima uestri culminis taliter[11] (31) collocare digneminj ut cuiusque[12] sinistrationis ab estu sim semper et uidear (32) esse secura.

Proposed emendations in the text of the third Battifolle letter as printed by Torri (*Epist.* X) *and Giuliani* (*Epist.* III*).

Title. *For* C. (*Torri*), Catharina (*Giul.*), *read* (*with MS.*) G.[13]

Text. *For* recepi et intellexi, *read* (*with MS.*) recepi, intellexi.

For accepi, *read* (*with MS.*) concepi[14].

For animus concipientis arripiat (*Torri*), *read* (*with MS. and G.*) arriserit.

For quasi ebria, *read* (*with MS.*) quasi debria[15].

For quod scribentis, *read* (*with MS.*) quae scribentis.

For nullam unquam (*Torri*), *read* (*with MS. and G.*) nunquam.

For supplicatione tempestivâ, *read* (*with MS.*) suppliciter tempestiva.

[1] T.G. *recepi et intellexi.*
[2] T. *familiater.*
[3] T.G. *accepi.*
[4] T. *arripiat*; G. *arriserit.*
[5] T.G. *ebria.*
[6] T.G. *quod.*
[7] T. *nullam unquam*; G. *nunquam.*
[8] T.G. *ad.*
[9] T.G. *clementiam.*
[10] T.G. *supplicatione.*
[11] G. *totaliter*; T. *taliter.*
[12] T.G. *cujuscumque.*
[13] See p. 21, n. 5.
[14] Cf. 'animus concipientis' in the next sentence; and 'ea quae continebantur in ipsa [pagina] cum tota cordis hilaritate concepi,' at the beginning of the first Battifolle letter (below, p. 23).
[15] *Debrius* is not registered by Giovanni da Genova in the *Catholicon*; he, however, gives '*Debrio, -as*, ex *de* et *ebrio, -as*; et potest ibi *de* esse intentivum vel privativum.' Du Cange registers *debriatus* and *debriatio*.

For totaliter collocare (*Giul.*), *read* (*with MS. and T.*) taliter collocare.

For cujuscumque sinistrationis, *read* (*with MS.*) cujusque sinistrationis.

Battifolle Letters—I.

(*Epist.* VIII in Torri; *Epist.* I* in Giuliani.)

(33) Illustrissime atque pijssime domine domine[1] Margarite diuina prouidentia (34) Romanorum Regine *et* semper Auguste fidelissima sua .G.[2] de batifolle[3] (35) dej et imperialis indulgentie gratia comitissa in tuscia palatina cum promptissima (36) recommendatione se ipsam et uoluntariam ad obsequia famulatum.

Cum (37) pagina uestre serenitatis apparuit ante scribentis *et* gratulantis asp-(38)-ectum experta est mea pura fidelitas quam[4] in dominorum successibus tam[5] sub-(39)-ditorum fidelium colletentur Nam per ea que continebantur in ipsa cum (40) tota cordis hilaritate concepi qualiter dextera summj regis uota cesaris [fol. 59vo] et Auguste feliciter adimplebat. proinde gradum mee fidelitatis (2) experta petentis audeo iam inire offitium ergo ad audientiam uestre sublimitatis (3) exorans et suppliciter precor et deuote deposco quatenus mentis oculis intuerj (4) digneminj prelibate interdum fidej puritatem. Verum quia[6] non nulla regalium (5) clausurarum[7] uidebatur ortari ut si quando nuntiorum facultas adesset celsitudi-(6)-ni regie aliquid peroptando[8] de status mei condictione referrem quamuis quedam (7) presumptionis faties interdicat obedientie tamen suadente uirtute obediam. (8) Audiat ex quo iubet romanorum pia et serena maiestas quoniam[9] tempore (9) missionis presentium coniunx predilectus *et* ego dei dono uigebamus incolu-(10)-mes liberorum sospitate gaudentes tanto solito letiores quanto signa (11) resurgentis imperij meliora iam secula promittebant.

Missum de castro poppij (12) .XV. kalendas Iunias faustissimj cursus henrici cesaris ad Italiam anno (13) primo.

[1] T.G. omit the second *domine*.
[2] T. *C.*; G. *Catharina*.
[3] T.G. *Battifolle*.
[4] G. *quantum*; T. *quam*.
[5] T.G. *pectora*.
[6] G. *quoniam*; T. *quia*.
[7] G. *clausularum*; T. *clausurarum*.
[8] T.G. *praeoptando*.
[9] T.G. *quod*.

Proposed emendations in the text of the first Battifolle letter as printed by Torri (Epist. VIII*) and Giuliani (Epist.* I*).*

Title. *For* piissimae dominae Margaritae, *read (with MS.)* piissimae dominae, dominae Margaritae[1].

For C. (*Torri*), Catharina (*Giul.*), *read (with MS.)* G.[2]

Title. *For* quantum in dominorum successibus (*Giul.*), *read (with MS. and T.)* quam in d. s.

For pectora subditorum, *read* animi subditorum[3].

For verum quoniam nonnulla (*Giul.*), *read (with MS. and T.)* verum quia n.

For quod tempore, *read (with MS.)* quoniam tempore[4].

§ V.

Epistola II (To the Counts Oberto and Guido of Romena).

This letter is one of the seven which, so far as is known, have been preserved in the Vatican MS. alone[5]. As in the case of *Epistola* VI, extracts from it, in German, were printed by Witte in 1838 in *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*[6]. The Latin text was first printed by Torri in 1842, in his edition of Dante's letters (*Epist.* II), and was reprinted, with emendations, in the editions of Fraticelli (*Epist.* II) and Giuliani (*Epist.* II), and in the Oxford Dante[7] (*Epist.* II).

In the *apparatus criticus* T. = Torri; F. = Fraticelli; G. = Giuliani; O. = Oxford Dante.

In the MS. the letter, which is preceded by a separate heading of two lines and a half, begins at l. 17 of fol. 59vo, and ends at l. 3 of fol. 60ro.

(14) Hanc ep*isto*lam scripsit dantes allagerij[8] Oberto et Guidonj comitibus (15) de Romena post mort*em* Alexandri comitis de Romena patrui eorum (16) co*n*dolens illius[9] de obitu suo.

[§ 1.] (17) Patruus uester Alexander comes illustris qui diebus p*ro*ximis cele-(18)-stem unde uenerat *secundum* sp*iritum*[10] remeauit ad

[1] For the repetition of *domina*, see the titles of the other two Battifolle letters (above).
[2] See p. 21, n. 5.
[3] The *tā* of the MS. is more likely to be a corruption of *āı̄* (*animi*) than of *pectora*. Another suggestion is that *tā* is a mistake for *cā*, an irregular abbreviation of *corda*.
[4] The use of *quoniam* for *quod* is not uncommon in medieval texts (see Du Cange, s.v. *Quoniam*).
[5] See above, p. 14. [6] See above, p. 1, n. 1. [7] See above, p. 5.
[8] T. *Alligherii*; F. *Allagerii*; G. *Allagherius*; O. *Alighierius*.
[9] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *illis*. [10] T. *spem*; F.G.O. *spiritum*.

patriam. dominus meus (19) erat *et* memoria[1] eius usque quo sub tempore uiuam dominabatur[2] michi quando (20) magnificentia sua que super astra nunc affluenter[3] dignis premijs me netatur[4] (21) me sibi ab annosis temporibus sponte sua fecit esse subiectum[5]. Hec equidem cunctis (22) alijs uirtutibus comitata in illo suum nomen pre titulis Italorum ereum[6] illustra-(23)-bat et quid aliud heroica sua signa dicebant nisi senticam[7] uitiorum (24) fugatricem ostendimus argenteas etenim senticas[8] in purpureo deferrebat (25) extrinsecus *et* intrinsecus mentem iam more[9] uirtutum uitia repellentem (26) doleat ergo doleat progenies maxima tuscanorum[10] que tanto uiro fulgebat (27) et doleant omnes amici eius *et* subditi quorum spem mors crudeliter uerbera-(28)-uit inter quos ultimos me miserum dolere oportet qui a patria pul-(29)-sus *et* exul immeritus infortunia mea rependens continuo cura[11] spe memet (30) consolabat[12] in illo

[§ 2.] sed quamquam sensualibus amissis doloris amaritudo incumbat (31) si considerentur intellectualia que supersunt sane[13] mentis oculis lux dulcis (32) consolationis exoritur nam qui uirtutem[14] honorabat in terris nunc a uirtutibus (33) honoratur in celis *et* qui Romane aule palatinus erat in Tuscia (34) nunc regie sempiterne aulicus preelectus[15] in superna[16] Ierusalem cum beatorum (35) principibus gloriatur. Quapropter carissimj dominj mej supplici exorta-(36)-tione uos deprecor quatenus modice dolore[17] uelitis *et* sensualia postergare (37) nisi prout uobis exemplaria esse possunt *et* quemadmodum ipse iustissimus (38) bonorum sibi uos instituit[18] in heredes si[19] ipsi uos tamquam proximiores ad (39) illum mores[20] eius egregios induatis

[§ 3.] ego autem preter hec me uestrum (40) uestre discretioni excusso de abscentia lacrimosis exequijs quia neć negli-(41)-gentia neue ingratitudo me tenuit. Sed inopina paupertas quam fecit [fol. 60ro] exilium. Hec etiam uelut effera persecutrix[21] equis armisque uacantem iam (2) sue captiuitatis me detrusit in antrum *et* nitentem cunctis exurgere (3) uiribus hucusque preualens impia retinere molitur.

[1] T. *memoriam*; F.G.O. *memoria*.
[2] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *dominabitur*.
[3] T. *affluentius*; F.G.O. *affluenter*.
[4] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *muneratur*.
[5] T.F.G.O. *subditum*.
[6] F.G.O. *heroum*; T. *aereum*.
[7] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *scuticam*.
[8] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *scuticas*.
[9] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *in amore*.
[10] G. *Tuscorum*; T.F.O. *Tuscanorum*.
[11] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *cura*; Witte apparently read *curam*—he renders: 'stets meine Sorgen durch die Hoffnung auf ihn beschwichtigte.'
[12] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *consolabar*.
[13] G. *sanae*; T.F.O. *sane*.
[14] T.F.G.O. *virtutes*.
[15] T. *praelectus*; F.G.O. *praeelectus*.
[16] T. *supernam*; F.G.O. *superna*.
[17] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *dolere*.
[18] T. *constituit*; F.G.O. *instituit*.
[19] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *sic*.
[20] MS. *momores*, with the first *mo* expunctuated.
[21] MS. *persecutris* corrected to *persecutrix*.

Proposed emendations in the Oxford text of Epist. II.

Title. *For* Aligherius, *read* Alagherii[1].

l. 10. *For* subditum, *read* (*with MS.*) subjectum.

l. 12. *For* heroum, *read* (*with MS. and Torri*) aereum[2].

ll. 24—5. *For* infortunia mea rependens, continuo cara spe memet..., *read* infortunia mea rependens continua cura, spe memet...[3].

l. 31. *For* virtutes, *read* (*with MS.*) virtutem.

§ VI.

Epistola III (*To Moroello Malaspina*).

This letter, like the preceding, is one of the seven which, so far as is known, have been preserved in the Vatican MS. alone[4]. It was first printed by Witte in 1842 in *Dante Alighieri's Lyrische Gedichte, übersetzt und erklärt von K. L. Kannegiesser und K. Witte* (Zweiter Theil, pp. 235—6). It was printed independently by Torri in the same year in his edition of Dante's letters (*Epist.* III), and was reprinted,

[1] See note on title of *Epist.* VII, above.

[2] There is not the least doubt about the MS. reading, which is unmistakably *ereum*=*aereum*, 'of bronze.'—'Suum nomen prae titulis Italorum aereum illustrabat,' i.e. caused his name to stand out, as it were graven in bronze (or 'lasting as bronze'—cf. 'aere perennius') above the empty titles (or 'fame') of his fellow-countrymen. (For the use of *titulus* in this sense cf. *Epist.* IV, ll. 10—12: 'ut...titulum mei nominis ampliares,' i.e. that you might enhance the renown of my name.) Torri renders: 'illuminava il suo nome scolpito in bronzo avanti a' titoli degl' Italiani.' For the adoption of the 'facilior lectio' *heroum*, Witte appears to have been responsible; for in his article, *Neu aufgefundene Briefe des Dante Allighieri* (see above, p. 1, n. 1), in which he gives a German translation of nearly the whole of the above letter, he renders: 'seinen Namen über die Verdienste anderer italienischer *Helden* verherrlichte'; and in a review of Torri's edition of Dante's letters (*Torris Ausgabe von Dantes Briefen*, see above, p. 3, n. 2), he ridicules Torri (whose rendering of the passage he ignores) for reading *aereum*. In the course of a discussion of this letter he says: 'Gleich darauf heisst es, die Grossmuth habe den Namen des Verstorbenen über die Verdienste anderer italienischen Helden verherrlicht (*prae titulis Italorum heroum*). In der Handschrift steht allerdings *ereum*, doch lag die Berichtigung nahe genug und war in meinem oft erwähnten Aufsatz angedeutet, aus dem auch bei Hrn. Torri (S. XXXIII) abgedruckt ist: *sopra degli altri eroi dell' Italia*. Dennoch heisst es im Texte *aereum*, so dass all die Grossmuth dem Alessandro hiernach den Beinamen des *ehernen* verschafft hätte!' (*D.-F.* I, 494). It seems highly improbable, however, that a scribe with *heroum* before him should have written *eroum* (without *h*) (which a subsequent copyist, we are to suppose, corrupted further into *ereum*), inasmuch as *heros* and its compounds seem invariably to have retained the aspirate; and, further, the same scribe has written *heroica* (with the *h*) correctly in the very next line of this same letter.

[3] This emendation, which is due to a friend, is preferable to that of the printed editions, inasmuch as it retains *cura*, and gets rid of the feeble expression *cara spe*. It seems better to read *continua* rather than *continuo*; but if the latter be allowed to stand, it could bear the meaning of 'continuously,' in which sense it is used by Quintilian, and by medieval writers. Uguccione da Pisa, in his *Magnae Derivationes*, says (s.v. *teneo*): 'Item a *continuus*, *continue* adverbium, pro quo saepe ponitur *continuo*, idest continuatim, vel statim sine interpolatione.'

[4] See above, p. 14.

with emendations, in the editions of Fraticelli (*Epist.* III) and Giuliani (*Epist.* III), and in the Oxford Dante[1] (*Epist.* III). A critical text was printed (c. 1902) in Oddone Zenatti's posthumous work, *Dante e Firenze* (pp. 431—2); and another was printed in 1903 by Francesco Torraca in his review of Zenatti's book in the *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana*, N.S. X, 143. A photographic reproduction from the Vatican MS., with a transcript (not entirely accurate[2]), was published in 1909 by Francesco Novati in *Dante e la Lunigiana* (pp. 518—20).

Portions of this letter were incorporated by Boccaccio in a letter of his own ('Ignoto Militi,' beginning, 'Mavortis miles extrenue'). The text of Boccaccio's letter is printed in full, with the parallel passages from Dante's letter, by G. Vandelli, in *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana*, N.S. VII, 64—7, from the Laurentian MS. XXIX, 8, the only MS. in which it has been preserved, and in which, as H. Hauvette has shown in his *Notes sur des Manuscrits Autographes de Boccace à la Bibliothèque Laurentienne* (pp. 22 ff.), it is written in Boccaccio's own hand.

In the *apparatus criticus* W. = Witte; T. = Torri; F. = Fraticelli; G. = Giuliani; O. = Oxford Dante; Z. = Zenatti; Ta. = Torraca; N. = Novati; B. = Boccaccio.

In the MS. the letter, which is preceded by a separate heading, consisting of a single line, begins at l. 5 of fol. 60ro, and ends in the middle of l. 25 of the same fol.

(4) Scribit Dantes do*mi*no Maroello[3] marchionj malaspine.

[§ 1.] (5) Ne lateant do*minum* uincula *se*rui suj q*uam*[4] affectus gratuitatis[5] do*mi*nantis[6] (6) et ne alia relata p*ro* alijs q*ue* falsar*um* opi*nionum* seminaria freq*uen*-(7)-tius esse solent negligentem[7] p*re*dicen*t* carceratu*m* ad *con*spectu*m* Ma-(8)-gnificentie u*estre* p*resen*tis oraculj[8] serie*m* placuit destinare.

[§ 2.] Igitur (9) michi a limine suspirare[9] postea curie seperato i*n* qua uelut se-(10)-pe[10] sub admirati*one* uidistis fas fuit sequi libertatis

[1] See above, p. 5.
[2] In l. 17 *pulsus* is omitted, and for *sola in sua* the transcript reads *ad sola sua*.
[3] F.G.O.Ta. *Moroello*; W.T.Z. *Maroello*.
[4] W.F.G.O.N. *quem*; Z.Ta. *quae*; T. *quam*; for *sui quam*, Wicksteed suggests *suique*.
[5] W. *gratuitae generositatis*; F.G.O. *gratitudinis*; Z. (followed by Wicksteed) *gratuitatio*; Ta. *gravitas*; T.N. *gratuitatis*.
[6] F.G.O.N. *dominantur*; W. *dominantis servum reddiderat*; T.Z.Ta. *dominantis*.
[7] T.F.G.O. *negligenter*; W.Z.Ta. *negligentem*.
[8] F. (following a conjecture of W.)G.O. *oratiunculae*; W.T.Z.Ta. *oraculi*.
[9] W.T.F.G.O.Z.Ta. *suspiratae*.
[10] W. omits *saepe*.

offitia[1] cum (11) primum pedes iuxta Sarni fluenta securus *et* incautus defigerem (12) subito heu mulier ceu fulgur descendens apparuit nescio quomodo (13) meis auspitijs undique moribus *et* forma[2] conformis, o quam[3] in eius apparitione[4] (14) ostupui *sed* stupor subsequentis tonitruj terrore cessauit nam sicut (15) diurnis[5] coruscationibus illico succedunt tonitrua sic inspecta flama (16) pulcritudinis huius[6] amor terribilis *et* imperiosus me tenuit. atque hic ferox (17) tamquam dominus pulsus a patria post longum exilium sola in sua repatrians (18) quicquid enim[7] contrarium fuerat intra[8] me uel occidit uel expulit[9] uel (19) ligauit. occidit ergo propositum illud laudabile quo a mulieribus[10] suis (20) cantibus[11] abstinebam. ac meditationes asiduas quibus tam celestia (21) quam terrestria intuebat[12] quasi suspectas[13] impie relegauit[14] *et* denique (22) ne contra se amplius anima rebellaret liberum meum ligauit arbitrium (23) ut non quo ego *sed* quo ille uult me uerti oporteat. Regnat[15] itaque (24) amor in me nulla refragante[16] uirtute[17] qualiterque me regat inferius (25) extra sinum presentium requiratis[18].

Proposed emendations in the Oxford text of Epist. III.

l. 2. *For* gratitudinis, *read* (*with MS. and Torri*) gratuitatis[19].

l. 5. *For* negligenter, *read* (*with MS. and Witte*) negligentem.

l. 7. *For* oratiunculae, *read* (*with MS. and Torri*) oraculi[20].

[1] In MS. there is a straight stroke over the *a*, which has the appearance of being an accidental mark (or perhaps an unusually heavy stroke to mark the previous *i*), rather than a mark of abbreviation, which is invariably slightly curved in the MS.

[2] T.F.G.O. *fortunae*; W.Z.Ta. *forma*; so B.

[3] W. *quantum*; T.F.G.O.Z.Ta. *quam*; so B.

[4] T.F.G.O. *admiratione*; W.Z.Ta. *apparitione*; so B.

[5] F.G.O.Ta. *divinis*; so apparently B; W.T.Z. *diurnis*.

[6] T.F.G.O. *ejus*; W.Z.Ta. *hujus*; so B.

[7] W.F.G.O. *ei*; T. *eidem*; Ta. *ejus*; so B.; Z. *enim*.

[8] Ta. *in*; so B.; W.T.F.G.O.Z. *intra*.

[9] T. *expulsit* (!).

[10] T. *muliebribus* (a suggestion of W., approved by Z.); W.F.G.O.Z.Ta. *mulieribus*; N. suggests *mulcebribus*.

[11] W.F.G.O. *suisque cantibus*; T.Z. *suis cantibus*; Ta. *satis cautus*; W. suggests *meis in cantibus*.

[12] W.T.F.G.O.Z.Ta. *intuebar*.

[13] T. *suspectans*; W.F.G.O.Z.Ta. *suspectas*.

[14] T. *religavit*; W.F.G.O.Z.Ta. *relegavit*.

[15] T.G. *Regnet*; W.F.O.Z.Ta. *Regnat*.

[16] B. *refragrante*.

[17] W. omits *nulla refragante virtute*.

[18] B. *queratis*.

[19] Cf. 'documenta gratuita,' in the third Battifolle letter (see above, p. 22). Zenatti's *gratuitatio*, derived, as he thought, from the reading of the MS., has been shown by Novati (*L' Epistola di Dante a Moroello Malaspina*, in *Dante e la Lunigiana*, pp. 523—4) to be the outcome of a delusion. What Zenatti confidently took for *o*, Novati has no difficulty in proving to be *s*, as it had previously always been assumed to be.

[20] On this use of the word *oraculum*, see Novati's above-mentioned article (pp. 527—9), where he quotes another instance, from a letter of Boccaccio*: 'Deprecor affectanter quatenus gratia vestri oraculi possim admissum solatium reassumere.'

* The same letter ('Ignoto Militi') in which Boccaccio has incorporated passages from this letter of Dante's (see above, p. 27).

l. 16. *For* fortunae, *read* (*with MS. and Witte*) forma[1].
l. 17. *For* admiratione, *read* (*with MS. and Witte*) apparitione[2].
l. 19. *For* divinis, *read* (*with MS., Witte, and Torri*) diurnis[3].
l. 21. *For* ejus, *read* (*with MS. and Witte*) hujus[4].
l. 25. *For* ei, *read* (*with Boccaccio*) ejus[5].

§ VII.

Epistola I (*To Niccolò da Prato*).

This letter, like the two preceding ones, is one of the seven which, so far as is known, have been preserved in the Vatican MS. alone. It was first printed by Torri in 1842, in his edition of Dante's letters (*Epist.* 1), and was reprinted, with emendations, in the editions of Fraticelli (*Epist.* 1) and Giuliani (*Epist.* 1), and in the Oxford Dante (*Epist.* 1)[6]. The text was printed from the MS. in Zenatti's *Dante e Firenze* (pp. 359—60).

In the *apparatus criticus*, T. = Torri; F. = Fraticelli; G. = Giuliani; O. = Oxford Dante; Z. = Zenatti.

In the MS. the heading of the letter (consisting of five lines and a half) begins at l. 26 of fol. 60ro, and ends in the middle of l. 31. The text of the letter, which immediately follows the heading without a break, begins in the middle of l. 31, and ends at l. 31 of fol. 60vo.

(26) Reuerendissimo in chr*ist*o patri d*omin*or*um* suor*um* carissimo d*omi*no Richol*ao*[7] (27) mis*erati*one celesti ostiensi *et* vallatrensi ep*iscop*o apo*st*olice sedis legato (28) necnon *et*[8] tuscia[9] roma*niola*[10] *et* marc*hia*[11] t*ervisina*[12] et p*ar*tib*us* circu*m* adiacentib*us* patiario (29) p*er* sacrosa*nc*tam eccl*es*iam ordinato, deuotissimj filij. A*lexander* c*apitaneus* co*n*silium et (30) uniu*ersi*tas p*ar*tis albor*um* de florentia semet ipsos deuotissime atq*ue* (31) p*ro*mptissime reccomendant.

[1] Boccaccio reads *forma*.
[2] This was likewise the reading of Boccaccio.
[3] Boccaccio (if the transcripts of his letter are to be trusted) read *divinis*. The reading of our MS. is unmistakably *diurnis*—the meaning would be, 'such as happen in our every day experience.'
[4] So also Boccaccio.
[5] The MS. reading *enim* is more likely a copyist's error for *eius* (the reading of Boccaccio) than for *ei*.
[6] See above, p. 5.
[7] *Sic*; T.F.O.Z. *Nicholao*; G. *Nicolao*.
[8] F.G.O.Z. *in*; T. *et*.
[9] T. *Tusciae*; F.G.O.Z. *Tuscia*.
[10] T. *Romaniolae*; F.G.O.Z. *Romaniola*.
[11] T. *Marchiae*; Z. *Marchia*; F.G.O. *Maritima*.
[12] T.F.G.O. *terris*; Z. *tarvisina*; in the MS. the abbreviation of this word (which was first correctly explained by Del Lungo) is written *t.* with *i* superscript.

[§ 1.] Preceptis salutar*ibus* moniti *et* apo*st*olica (32) pietate rogati sacre uocis *con*textuj que*m* misistis post cara nobis *con*-(33)-scilia respondemus *et* si negligentie sontes aut *in*gnauie cen-(34)-seremur ob *in*iuria*m* tarditatis citra iuditiu*m* discretio *san*cta (35) ue*st*ra *pre*ponderet[1] et qua*n*tis qualib*usque con*scilijs *et* responsis obse*r*ua-(36)-ta sinceritate consortij ue*st*ra[2] fraternitas decenter *pro*cedendo indi-(37)-geat *et*[3] examinatis que tangim*us* ubi forte *contra* debita*m* celeritate*m* (38) defecisse despicimur ut affluentie[4] ue*st*re benignitatis *in*dulgeat de-(39)-*pre*camur

[§ 2.] ceu filij non *in*grati literas[5] igitur pie paternitatis[6] aspexim*us* [fol. 60vo] que totius ue*st*ri[7] desiderij pe*r*sonantes exordia subito me*n*tes no*st*ras subi-(2)-to[8] tanta letitia pe*r*fuderu*nt*[9] qua*n*ta*m* nemo ualeret seu ue*r*bo seu cogi-(3)-tati*one* metirj na*m* q*uam* fere p*rae*[10] desiderio so*m*niantes *in*hiabamus patrie sa-(4)-nitatem[11] ue*st*rar*um* *litera*r*um* series plusq*uam* semel sub paterna monit*ione* poluxi*t*[12]. (5) et ad quid aliud *in* ciuile bellu*m* co*r*ruim*us* q*uid* aliud candida ue*st*ra[13] signa (6) petebant et ad q*uid* aliud enses et tela ue*st*ra[14] rubea*nt*[15] nisi ut q*ui* ciuilia (7) iura temeraria uoluptate[16] tru*n*cauera*nt* *et* iugo pie legis colla (8) su*m*mitte-re*nt* *et* ad pace*m* patrie cogeren*tur*? Quipe no*st*re intenti-(9)-onis cuspis legiptima de neruo que*m* tendebam*us* p*ro*rum*p*ens quie-(10)-tem solam *et* libertate*m* popu*l*j Florentinj petebat. Petijt[17] atq*ue* pe-(11)-tet *in* poster*um* q*uod* si ta*m*[18] gratissimo nobis be*n*efitio uigilatis *et* adue*r*-sarios (12) no*st*ros p*r*out *san*cta conami*n*a no*st*ra[19] uoluerin*t* ad sulcos bone ciuilitatis (13) *in*tenditis remeare quis uobis dignas grates pe*r*solue*re* atentabit? (14) Nec opis e*st* no*st*re pa*ter*[20] nec q*uic*q*uid* Florentine gentis repe*r*itu*r* in te*r*ris (15) se*d* si qua celo e*st* pietas q*ue* talia remuneranda[21] p*ro*spitiat illa uo-(16)-bis p*re*mia digna ferat q*ui* tante urbis mise*r*icordia*m* *in*duistis *et* ad se-(17)-danda ciuiu*m*[22] p*ro*fana litigia festinatis.

[1] G. *perpendat*; T.F.O.Z. *praeponderet*.
[2] T.F.G.O.Z. *nostra*.
[3] G. *At*; T.F.O.Z. *et*.
[4] T.F.G.O.Z. *affluentia*.
[5] T.G. *deprecamur, ceu filii non ingrati. Literas*—F.O.Z. *deprecamur. Ceu filii non ingrati literas*.
[6] F.G.O. *paternitatis vestrae*; T.Z. *paternitatis*.
[7] F.G.O.Z. *nostri*; T. *vestri*.
[8] T.F.G.O.Z. omit *subito* here.
[9] F. *perfunderunt* (!).
[10] T.F.G.O. *pro*; Z. *prae*.
[11] T. *libertatem*; F.G.O.Z. *sanitatem*.
[12] T.F.G.O.Z. *pollicetur*.
[13] T.F.G.O.Z. *nostra*.
[14] T.F.G.O.Z. *nostra*.
[15] T.F.G.O.Z. *rubebant*; Novati proposes *ruebant*.
[16] T. *voluntate*; F.G.O.Z. *voluptate*.
[17] F.G.O.Z. *petit*; T. *petiit*.
[18] T. *tantum*; F.G.O.Z. *tam*.
[19] T. omits *nostra*.
[20] T. *proprium*; F.G.O.Z. *pater*.
[21] T.G. *remunerando*; F.O.Z. *remuneranda*.
[22] MS. *ciuilium*, the *li* being expunctuated.

[§ 3.] Sane cu*m* p*er* sa*n*cte religi-(18)-onis viru*m* fr*a*tr*e*m .L. ciuilitatis p*er*suasorem *et* pacis p*re*moniti at-(19)-q*ue* requisitj sum*us* instanter p*ro* uobis q*uem*admod*um* et ipse ue*st*re l*i*t*e*re co*n*ti-(20)-nebant ut ab om*n*i guerrar*um* i*n*sultu cessaremus et usu et nos (21) ipsos in paternas man*us* ue*st*ras exiberemus i*n* totu*m* nos filij deuotis-(22)-simj uobis et pacis amatores *et* iusti exuti iam[1] gladijs ar-(23)-bitrio ue*st*ro spontanea *et* sincera uoluntate subim*us* ceu relatu (24) p*re*fatj ue*st*ri nu*n*tij fr*a*t*r*is .L. narabit*ur* *et* p*er* publica instr*ument*a sole*m*pniter (25) celebrata liquebit.

Idcirco pietati clem*en*tissime ue*st*re filialj uoce (26) affectuosissime supplicamus quat*enus* illa*m* diu exagitata*m* Floren*tiam* (27) sopore tranquillitatis et pacis irrigare uelitis ei*usque* semper (28) popu*l*um defensantes nos et q*ui* nost*ri* sunt iuris ut pius pater com-(29)-mendatos h*ab*ere qui uelut a patrie caritate nu*n*q*uam* destitim*us* sic (30) de p*re*ceptor*um* ue*st*ror*um* limitibus nu*n*q*uam* exorbitare i*n*tendimus s*ed* se*m*p*er* (31) ta*m* debite q*uam* deuote quibuscu*m*q*ue* ue*st*ris obedire mandatis.

Proposed emendations in the Oxford text of Epist. I.

Title. *For* Maritima, terris, *read* Marchia Tervisina[2].

l. 16. *For* Paternitatis vestrae aspeximus, *read* (*with MS.*) Paternitatis aspeximus.

l. 18. *For* subito mentes nostras tanta letitia, *read* (*with MS.*) subito mentes nostras subito tanta laetitia.

l. 21. *For* pro desiderio, *read* (*with MS.*) prae desiderio.

l. 24. *For* pollicetur, *read* (*with MS.*) polluxit[3].

[1] In MS. between *exuti* and *iam* is a curved line (the beginning of the *g* of *gladiis*), which is expunctuated.

[2] Del Lungo, to whom the correct interpretation of the MS. reading is primarily due, refers (*Dino Compagni e la sua Cronica*, II, 587 n.) to the Bulls of Benedict XI, dated Jan. 31, 1304, constituting Cardinal Niccolò da Prato legate and pacificator in Tuscany, Romagna, and the March of Treviso. Cf. Potthast, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, p. 2030, No. 25348: 'Nicolao Ostiensi episcopo in partibus Tusciae in imperio constitutis, Romaniola et marchia Tervisina...plenae legationis officium committit'; and No. 25349: 'Eundem in provinciis Tusciae, Romaniolae, marchiae Tarvisinae ac partibus circumiacentibus constituit pacis conservatorem ac paciarium.'

[3] Every printed edition of this letter reads *pollicetur* here, yet the MS. reading *polūx* is perfectly plain. This was recognised by Zenatti (who made a fresh collation of the MS.) in his *apparatus criticus*, where he says 'quasi *polluxit*'; yet he printed *pollicetur* in his text. Apparently Z. was not aware of the existence of the verb *pollucere*, which is registered by Giovanni da Genova in the *Catholicon*: '*Polluceo, -luceo* componitur cum *post*, vel *procul*, vel *porro*, et dicitur *polluceo, -ces, -xi, -ctum, -cere*, idest dono, promitto, quia promissis solemus polliceri et donis; vel *pollucere* est offerre, quia post sacrificium solent fieri oblationes.'

l. 27. *For* rubebant, *perhaps read* (*with Novati*) ruebant[1].

l. 37. *For* conamina nostra, *read* conamina vestra[2].

§ VIII.

Epistola V (*To the Princes and Peoples of Italy*).

The Latin text of this letter has been preserved in one other MS. besides the Vatican MS., namely *Cod. S. Pantaleo* 8 in the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele at Rome, a fourteenth century MS., which contains also the Latin text of Dante's letter to the Emperor Henry VII (*Epist.* VII)[3].

This letter was first printed in an early Italian translation (attributed, like that of the letter to Henry VII, to Marsilio Ficino), by Pietro Lazzari, in *Miscellaneorum ex MSS. libris Bibliothecae Collegii Romani Societatis Jesu tomus primus* (pp. 139—144), which was published at Rome in 1754. Another text, from *Cod. Riccardiano* 1304, was printed by Ignazio Moutier at Florence in 1823, in Vol. VIII (pp. lvii—lxiii) of his edition of *La Cronica di Giovanni Villani*. An amended text was printed by Witte at Padua in 1827, in his edition of Dante's letters (*Epistola quinta*, pp. 19—26)[4]; and Witte's text was reprinted, with further emendations, at Florence in 1840 by Fraticelli in his edition (*Epist.* II, pp. 213—22).

The Latin text of the letter was first printed (from an unidentified MS.) by Francescomaria Torricelli in the *Antologia di Fossombrone* for 22 Oct. 1842. It was first printed from the Vatican MS. by Torri in 1842, in his edition of Dante's letters (*Epist.* V), and was reprinted, with emendations, in the editions of Fraticelli (*Epist.* V) and Giuliani (*Epist.* V), and in the Oxford Dante (*Epist.* V)[5].

[1] The MS. reading *rubeant* is obviously corrupt. Novati (*Le Epistole di Dante*, in *Lectura Dantis: Le Opere Minori di D. A.*, 1906, p. 310) regards it as 'semplice errore di copista per *ruebant*,' and thinks Dante had in mind the Virgilian phrase 'in arma ruere' (*Aen.* XI, 886). Those who read *rubebant* explain the word, either as 'were crimson with blood' (as, for instance, Zenatti, who thinks the reference is to the fighting in the Mugello in 1302 and 1303); or as 'flashed in the sun' (as Fraticelli, who renders 'scintillavano'; or Del Lungo, who thinks the reference is to 'il fatto di Lastra' of 20 July 1304, and points to the details of Dino Compagni's account of the incident in his *Cronica*, III, 10). In favour of *rubebant* in the former sense would be the rhetorical antithesis to 'candida signa' in the previous sentence.

[2] The confusion in the MS. between *vestra* and *nostra* is frequent; in this passage the correction of *nostra* to *vestra* seems obviously required; the writers would hardly speak of their own '*sancta* conamina,' whereas the epithet would be eminently appropriate as applied to the Papal Legate (cf. 'sacrae vocis,' l. 2; and 'discretio sancta vestra,' ll. 6—7, of this same letter).

[3] See above, p. 4. I have unfortunately not yet been able to procure a collation of this MS.

[4] See above, p. 5.

[5] See above, p. 5.

In the *apparatus criticus*, for the Latin text, Tc. = Torricelli[1]; T. = Torri; F^2. = Fraticelli (1857); G. = Giuliani; O. = Oxford Dante; for the Italian text, L. = Lazzari; M. = Moutier; W. = Witte; F^1. = Fraticelli (1840).

In the MS. the heading of the letter (consisting of three lines) begins at l. 32 of fol. 60^{vo}; there is a considerable hiatus in the middle of l. 33, and there is a second hiatus at the end of l. 34, leaving the last part of the heading and the commencement of the text of the letter incomplete. The letter itself begins, in the middle of a sentence, at l. 35 of fol. 60^{vo}, and ends in the middle of l. 8 of fol. 62^{ro}, the rest of which is left blank, without colophon or any indication that it is the end of the MS. On the left-hand margin of fol. 60^{vo}, alongside the heading of the letter is written in red and, according to Zenatti[2], in the hand of Francesco da Montepulciano, the owner of the MS.[3], 'Epistola Dantis in florentinos.' Besides the hiatus in the heading and at the beginning of the letter already mentioned, there are more or less considerable hiatus in l. 36 of fol. 60^{vo}, l. 20 of fol. 61^{ro}, and in ll. 3, 4, 6, 7, 32, 33 of fol. 61^{vo}.

(32) Uniuersis et singulis Italie Regibus et senatoribus alme (33) urbis necnon [4] atque populis humilis Italus (34) Dantes Alagerij[5] florentinus et exul immeritus or [6] [§ 1.] . [7] (35) tempus acceptabile quo signa surgunt consolationis et pacis, nam (36) dies noua spendescit[8] al [9] demostrans[10] que[11] iam (37) tenebras diuturne calamitatis attenuat iamque aure orien-(38)-tales crebrescunt rutilat celum in labijs suis et auspitia gentium (39) blanda serenitate confortat. et nos gaudium expectatum[12] uide-(40)-bimus qui diu pernotitauimus[13] in deserto. Quoniam[14] titan exorietur [fol. 61^{ro}] pacificus et iustitia sine sole quasi

[1] The variants from Torricelli's text (of which I have not been able to procure a copy) are registered by Torri in his edition (pp. 151—2).

[2] See *Dante in Firenze*, pp. 377—8. [3] See above, p. 1.

[4] Hiatus in MS.; T. *necnon gentibus atque populis*; F^2.G.O. *necnon ducibus, marchionibus, comitibus, atque populis*; L.M.W.F^1. *A tutti ed a ciascuno* (M. *e ciascuni*) *re d' Italia ed a' senatori di Roma, a'* (L. *et*) *duchi,* (M. *e*) *marchesi,* (F^1. *e*) *conti ed a tutti i popoli.*

[5] T. *Allagherii*; G. *Allagherius*; O. *Alighierius*; F^2. *Alagerii.*

[6] Hiatus in MS.; T.F^2.G.O. *orat pacem*; L.M.W.F^1. *prega pace.*

[7] Hiatus in MS.; Tc. *Ecce nunc tempus*; T.F^2.G.O. *Ecce nunc*; L.M.W.F^1. *Ecco ora il tempo accettabile.*

[8] *Sic*; T.F^2.G.O. *splendescit.*

[9] Hiatus in MS.; T.G. *alborem*; Tc.F^2.O. *albam*; L.M.W.F^2. *mostrando da Oriente l' Aurora.*

[10] *Sic*; T.F^2.G.O. *demonstrans.* [11] T.G. *qui*; Tc.F^2.O. *quae.*

[12] T. *exoptatum*; Tc.F^2.G.O. *expectatum*; L.M.W.F^1. *l' aspettata allegrezza.*

[13] *Sic*, no doubt for *pernoctitavimus*; T.F^2.G.O. *pernoctavimus*; L. *dimoriamo*; M.W.F^1. *dimorammo.* [14] Tc. *quum*; T.F^2.G.O. *quoniam.*

elietropium hebetata[1]. cum primum iubar (2) ille uibrauit[2] reuirescet saturabuntur omnes qui exuriunt[3] *et* sitiunt in (3) lumine radiorum eius *et* confundentur qui diligunt iniquitatem a fatie coru-(4)-scantis. Arrescit[4] namque aures misericordes[5] leo fortis de tribu Iuda (5) atque ululatum uniuersalis[6] captiuitatis miserans Moisen (6) alium[7] suscitauit qui de grauaminibus egiptiorum populum suum erripiet (7) ad terram lacte ac mele[8] manantem perducens.

[§ 2.] Letare iam nunc miseranda Italia (8) etiam saracenis que statin inuidiosa per orbem uideberis quia sponsus tuus (9) mundi solatium et gloria plebis tue clementissimus[9] henricus diuus *et* Au-(10)-gustus *et* cesar ad nuptias properat exica[10] Lacrimas et meroris ue-(11)-stigia dele pulcerrima nam prope est qui liberabit te de carcere impiorum (12) qui percutiens malignantes in ore gladij perdet eos *et* uineam suam aliis locabit (13) agricolis. qui fructum iustitie reddant in tempore messis.

[§ 3.] Sed non an[11] miserebitur (14) cuiquam[12] imo ignoscet omnibus misericordiam implorantibus cum sit Cesar (15) et maiestas eius de fonte defluat pietatis Huius iuditium omnem se-(16)-ueritatem abhorret *et* semper citra medium plectens ultra medium pre-(17)-miando se figit. Anne propterea nequam[13] hominum applaudet audatias[14] (18) et initis[15] presumptionum[16] pocula propinabit? absit quoniam Augustus (19) est *et* si Augustus nonne relapsorum facinora uindicabit et usque (20) in tesaliam persequetur. tesalia[17] inquam[18] finalis delectionis[19].

[§ 4.] pone sangu [20] lon-(21)-gobardorum coadductam barberiem et si quid de troianorum latinorumque (22) semine superest

[1] F². *quasi ad h. h.*; G.O. *q. ut h. h.*; T. *quasi heliotropium h.*; L.M.W.F¹. *senza luce al termine della retrogradazione impigrita.*
[2] *Sic*; T.F².G.O. *vibraverit.*
[3] *Sic*; T.F².G.O. *esuriunt.*
[4] *Sic*; T.F².G.O. *arrexit.*
[5] Tc. *misericordiae*; T.F².G.O. *misericordes.*
[6] MS. *uniuersalistis*, with the final *tis* expunctuated.
[7] T. *alterum*; F².G.O. *alium*; L.M.W.F¹. *un altro.*
[8] Tc. *melle et lacte*; T.F².G.O. *lacte ac melle.*
[9] Tc. *clemens*; T.F².G.O. *clementissimus*; L.M.W.F¹. *pietosissimo.*
[10] *Sic*; T.F².G.O. *exsicca.*
[11] Tc. *Sed an*; T.F².G.O. *Sed an non.*
[12] T. *Augustus*; Tc. *cuique*; F².G.O. *cuiquam*; L.M.W.F¹. *d' alcuno.*
[13] Tc.T. *nequiorum*; F².G.O. *nequam.*
[14] T.F².G.O. *audaciis.*
[15] T.F².O. *initiis*; Tc. *initibus*; G. *rictibus*; Boehmer (*Dante-Jahrbuch*, I, 396) proposes *ineptiis*; L.M.W.F¹. *dolce e piano* (obviously derived from a reading, or supposed reading, *mitis*).
[16] G. *praesumptiosorum*; T.F².O. *praesumptionum*; L. *beveraggi prosumptuosi*; M. *b. per superstiziosi*; W. *b. presuntuosi*; F¹. *b. perniziosi.*
[17] T.F².G.O. *Thessaliam*; Tc. *Thessalia.*
[18] Tc. *ignis*; T.F².G.O. *inquam.*
[19] T.F².G.O. *deletionis*; L.M.W.F¹. *dilezione*; the Italian translation renders the foregoing sentence (*et usque...delectionis*) as follows: L.W.F¹. *ed insino in Tessaglia perseguirà Tessaglia, ma perseguiralla di finale dilezione*; M. *e i. in T. perseguiterà, per T. seguirallo infinale dilezione.*
[20] Hiatus in MS.; T.F².G.O. *Pone, sanguis L.*; L.M.W.F¹. *O sangue de' Longobardi, pon giuso.*

illi[1] cede [2] cum sublimis aquila fulguris instar descen-(23)-dens affuerit abiectos uideat pullos eius et prolis proprie locum coruulis (24) occupatum. eya facite scandinauie soboles ut cuius merito trepi-(25)-datis aduentum quod[3] ex uobis est presentiam scitiatis[4]. nec seducat allu-(26)-dens[5] cupiditas more sirenum nescio qua dulcedine uigiliam rationis (27) mortificans preocupatis[6] fatiem eius in confessione subiectionis et psalterio (28) penitentie iubiletis considerantes quia[7] potestati resistens dej ordinationi (29) resistit et qui diuine ordinationi repugnat uoluntati omnipoten-(30)-tie coequalj recalcitrat et durum est contra stimulum calcitrare.

[§ 5.] Vos (31) autem qui lugetis oppressi animum subleuate quoniam prope est uestra salus asum-(32)-mite rastrum bone humilitatis atque glebis exuste animositatis occatis (33) agellum sternite mentis uestre ne forte celestis imber sementem uestram (34) ante iactum preueniens in uacuum de altissimo cadat non[8] resiliet[9] gratia (35) dei ex uobis tamquam ros cotidianus ex lapide sed uelut fecunda ual-(36)-lis concipite[10] ac uiride germinetis[11] uiride dico fructiferum[12] uere pa-(37)-cis qua quidem uiriditate uestra terra uernante nouus agricola (38) Romanorum conscilij suj boues ad aratrum affectuosius et confiden-(39)-tius coniugabit. parcite parcite iam exnunc[13] o carissimj qui mecum (40) iniuriam passi[14] estis ut hectoreus pastor uos oues de ouilj suo [fol. 61vo] cognoscat cui etsi animaduersio[15] temporalis diuinitus est indulta tamen (2) ut eius bonitatem redoleat a quo uelut a puncto biffurcatur petri cesaris-(3)-que potestas uoluptuose famili [16] miseretur.

[§ 6.] (4) Itaque si culpa uetus non obest que plerumque suppi

[1] T. *illis*; F².G.O. *illi*; L.M.W.F¹. *a lui.*
[2] Hiatus in MS.; T.F².G.O. *ne*; L.M.W. *acciocchè...veggia*; F¹. *acciocchè...non veggia.*
[3] T.F².G.O. *quantum*; L.M.W.F¹. *in quanto.*
[4] *Sic*; T.G. *sentiatis*; F².O. *sitiatis*; L. *vogliate*; M.W.F¹. *godiate.*
[5] *Sic*; T.F¹.G.O. *illudens*; L.M.W.F¹. *ingannatrice.*
[6] T.F².G.O. *Praeoccupetis*; L.M.W.F¹. *Occupate.*
[7] T.F².G.O. *quod*; Tc. *quia*; L.M.W.F¹. *che.*
[8] F².G.O. *neve*; T. *non*; Tc. *non enim.*
[9] T.F².G.O. *resiliat*; Tc. *resiliet*; L.M.W.F¹. *nè torni indietro* (M. *addietro*).
[10] F².O. *concipiatis*; T.G. *concipite*; L.M.W.F¹. *concepete.*
[11] G. *germinate*; T.F².O. *germinetis*; L.M.W.F¹. *producete.*
[12] Tc. *fructiferorum*; T.F².O. *fructiferum.*
[13] G. *et nunc*; T.F².O. *ex nunc*; L.M.W.F¹. *oggimai.*
[14] Tc. *pasti*; T.F².G.O. *passi*; L.M.W.F¹. *avete sofferta.*
[15] In MS. before *animaduersio* is *aduersario*, which has been expunctuated.
[16] Hiatus in MS.; T. *voluptuosae familiae libentius miseretur*; F².O. *voluptuose familiam suam corrigit, libentius vero ejus miseretur*; G. *voluptuose familiae suae miseretur*; L.M.W.F¹. *desiderosamente la sua famiglia corregge, ma* (M. *ma a sè*) *più volonterosamente misericordia tribuisce*; Barbi (in *Bull. Soc. Dant.*, N.S., II, 23 n.) supplies the hiatus as follows from Cod. S. Pantaleo 8: *voluptuose familiam suam corrigit sed ei voluptuosius miseretur.*

[1] (5) et uertit*ur* in seipsam huic[2] utriqu*e*[3] potestis aduertere pace*m* unicuiqu*e* (6) [4] et [5] erate letitie iam pr*i*mitias degustare. Euigi-(7)-late igitur om*n*es *et* asurgite regi ue*st*ro [6] non (8) solu*m* sibi ad Imper*i*um *sed* ut liberi ad regimen reser*u*ati.

[§ 7.] Nec (9) t*antum*[7] ut asurgatis exortor s*ed* ut illius obstupescatis aspectu*m*[8] (10) qui bibitis fluenta ei*us* ei*usque* maria nauigatis qui calcatis are-(11)-nas litor*um* et alpi*um* su*m*mitates q*ue* su*n*t sue qui publicis qui-(12)-buscu*mque* gaudetis *et* res pr*i*uatas uinculo sue legis no*n* al*i*ter (13) possidetis. Nolite uelut ignari decipe*re* uosmet ipsos tamquam so*m*-(14)-niantes *in* cordib*us* *et* dicentes d*o*min*um* non h*a*bemus. ortus e*n*im eius (15) et lacus est q*uod* celu*m* circuit. na*m* dei est mare et ipse fecit (16) illud et aridam fundauerun*t* manu*s* est[9]. unde[10] deu*m* romanu*m* (17) pr*i*ncipe*m* pr*e*destinasse relucet *in* miris effectibus. *et* ue*r*bo ue*r*bj co*n*-(18)-firmasse propr*e*erius[11] pr*o*fitetur eccl*e*sia.

[§ 8.] Nempe si a creatura mu*n*-(19)-di *in*uisibilia dej p*er* ea que facta su*n*t *in*tellecta[12] *con*spitiu*n*tur *et* si (20) ex notioribus nobis[13] *in*notiora simp*liciter*[14] interest[15] hu*m*ane app*r*ehensi-(21)-onj ne[16] p*er* motu*m* celi motore*m* *intelli*gamus *et* eius uelle facile pr*e*de-(22)-stinatio hec *etiam* leuiter *in*tuentibus *in*notescat[17]. N*a*m si a p*r*ima hui*us* (23) ign*is*[18] reuoluamus p*r*eter*i*ta ex quo s*cilicet* argis hospitalitas est[19]

[1] Hiatus in MS.; T.F[2].G.O. *plerumque serpentis modo torquetur et vertitur*; Tc. *plerumque supervenit...et vertitur*; L.M.W.F[1]. *spesse volte come serpente si storce, ed in sè medesima si travolge* (M. *si travoglie*); Barbi (*loc. cit.*) supplies the hiatus from Cod. S. Pantaleo 8: *plerumque suppinatur ut coluber et vertitur.*

[2] F[2].G.O. *hinc*; T. *huic*; L.M.W.F[1]. *quinci.*

[3] G. *ubique*; T.F[2].O. *utrique*; L.M.W.F[1]. *ed all' uno ed all' altro.*

[4] Hiatus in MS.; T. *unicuique gratissimam et*; F[2].G.O. *u. esse paratam et*; Tc. *uniuscujusque et*; L.M.W.F[1]. *a ciascuno essere apparecchiato* (L. *apparecchiata*); Barbi (*loc. cit.*) supplies the hiatus from Cod. S. Pantaleo 8: *unicuique preparari et.*

[5] Slight hiatus in MS.; T. *oratae*; Tc.F[2].G.O. *speratae*; L.W. *di disperata*; M. *di sperata*; F[1]. *di insperata*; Barbi (*loc. cit.*) from Cod. S. Pantaleo 8: *insperate* (MS. *insperare*).

[6] Hiatus in MS.; T.F[2].G.O. *incolae Italiae*; L.M.W.F[1]. *o abitatori d' Italia*; Barbi (*loc. cit.*) from Cod. S. Pantaleo 8: *incole Latiales.*

[7] T. *nec tamen*; F[2].G.O. *nec tantum*; L.M.W.F[1]. *nè solamente.*

[8] G. *aspectu*; T.F[2].O. *aspectum.*

[9] *Sic*, by an obvious scribal error for *eius*, the word exactly above in the previous line being *est*; T.F[2].G.O. *ejus.*

[10] G. *Et*; Tc. *Undique*; T.F.O. *Unde.*

[11] *Sic*; T.F[2].G.O. *posterius*; L.W.F[1]. *essere poscia confermato*; M. *essere posto e c.*

[12] T.F[2].O. *intellectu*; G. *intellecta.* [13] Tc. omits *nobis.*

[14] Tc.T.F[2].G.O. *similiter*; Boehmer (*Dante-Jahrbuch*, I, 396) proposes *si similiter.*

[15] G. *innotescunt*; T.F[2].O. *interest.* [16] T.F[2].G.O. *ut*; L.M.W.F[1]. *sicchè.*

[17] T.F[2].G.O. *innotescet*; L.W.F[1]. *sieno chiare*; M. *fieno chiari.*

[18] T. *a prima hujus origine*; F[2].G.O. *a prima hujus ignis favilla*; L.M.W.F[1]. *dalla prima favilla di questo fuoco.*

[19] T.F[2].G.O. omit *est.*

a (24) frigibus deregata[1] et usque ad octauianj triumphos mundj (25) gesta reuisere uacet nulla[2] eorum uidebimus humane uirtutis omnino (26) culmina transcendisse *et* deum per homines tamquam per celos nouos aliquid (27) operatum fuisse, non eternj[3] semper nos agimus quin[4] interdum utensilia (28) dei sumus ac uoluntates humane quibus inest ex natura libertas (29) *etiam* inferioris affectus immunes quandoque aguntur et obnoxie uoluntati (30) eterne sepe illj ancillantur ignare

[§ 9.] *Et* si hec que ubi[5] principia sunt (31) ad probandum quod queritur non sufficiunt[6] quis non ab illata conclusi-(32)-one[7] per talia precedentia[8] [9] cum opinari cogetur? pace[10] videlicet[11] (33) annorum duodecim orbem totaliter amplexata[12] que[13] sui silogiza [14] (34) fatiem[15] dei filium[16] sicuti opere patrato ostenditur[17]? Et hic cum ad reue-(35)-lationem spiritus homo factus euangelizaret in terris quasi dirimens (36) duo regna sibi *et* cesari uniuersa distribuens alterutri (37) duxit[18] reddi que sua sunt.

[§ 10.] Quod[19] si pertinax animus[20] poscit ulterius (38) nondum annuens ueritati uerba christi examinet *etiam* iam ligatj (39) cuj cum potestatem suam pilatus obiceret lux nostra de sursum esse aseruit [fol. 62ro] quod ille iactabat qui Cesaris ibi auctoritate vicaria gerebat officium. Non (2) igitur ambuletis sicut *et* gentes[21] ambulant in uanitate sensus (3) tenebris obscurati, sed aperite oculos mentis uestre ac uidete quoniam (4) regem nobis celi *et*[22] terre dominus ordinauit. Hic est quem petrus (5) dej uicarius honorificare nos monet. quem Clemens nunc (6) petri successor luce apostolice benedictionis illuminat ut ubi ra-(7)-dius spiritualis non sufficit ibi splendor minoris lumi-(8)-naris[23] illustret.

[1] *Sic*; Tc.F².O. *denegata*; T. *derogata*; G. *defraudata*; L.M.W.F¹. *negata*.
[2] T.F².G.O. *nonnulla*; L.M.W.F¹. *molte cose*.
[3] Tc.T.F².G.O. *etenim*; L.M.W.F¹. *ed in verità non sempremai*.
[4] T. *quia*; F².G.O. *quin*; L.M.W.F¹. *anzi*.
[5] T.F².G.O. *uti*; L.M.W.F¹. *siccome*. [6] T. *sufficient*; F².G.O. *sufficiunt*.
[7] Tc. *ad illatam conclusionem*; T.F².G.O. *ab illata conclusione*; L.M. *della conceduta conclusione* (W.F¹. omit).
[8] F².G.O. *procedendo*; T. *praecedentia*; L.M.W.F¹. *innanzi passando*.
[9] Hiatus in MS.; T. *ita mecum*; F².G.O. *nobiscum*.
[10] Tc. *in pace*; F².G.O. *pacem*; T. *pace*.
[11] T. *vidimus*; F².G.O. *videns*; Tc. *videlicet*; L.M.W.F¹. *cioè*.
[12] F².G.O. *amplexatam*; T. *amplexata*. [13] G. *qua*; T.F².O. *quae*.
[14] Hiatus in MS.; T.F².G.O. *syllogizatoris*; L.M.W.F¹. *del suo sillogizzatore*.
[15] Tc.G. *facies*; T.F².O. *faciem*. [16] Tc. *filius*; G. *filii*; T.F².O. *filium*.
[17] F².O. *ostendit*; T.G. *ostenditur*.
[18] T.G.O. *dixit*; F². *duxit*; L.M.W.F¹. *commandò*. [19] Tc. *quare*; T.F².G.O. *quod*.
[20] Tc.G. *aliquis*; T.F².O. *animus*; L.M.W.F¹. *animo*. [21] Corrected from *gens*.
[22] T.F².G.O. *ac*.
[23] Tc. *luminis*; T.F².G.O. *luminaris*; M.W.F¹. *lume* (L. omits).

Proposed emendations in the Oxford text of Epist. v.

Title. *For* Alighierius, *read* Alagherii[1].

l. 9. *For* pernoctavimus, *read* pernoctitavimus[2].

ll. 43—4. *For* audaciis, *read* (*with MS.*) audacias[3].

l. 44. *For* initiis, *read* (*with Torricelli*) initibus[4].

l. 58. *For* quantum ex vobis est, *read* (*with MS.*) quod ex vobis est.

l. 64. *For* considerantes quod, *read* (*with MS.*) considerantes quia[5].

l. 76. *For* neve resiliat, *read* (*with MS. and Torricelli*) non resiliet.

l. 79. *For* concipiatis, *read* (*with MS.*) concipite.

ll. 92—3. *For* libentius vero ejus miseretur, *read* sed ei voluptuosius miseretur[6].

l. 95. *For* plerumque serpentis modo torquetur et vertitur, *read* plerumque supinatur ut coluber et v[7].

ll. 97—8. *For* unicuique esse paratam et speratae laetitiae, *read* unicuique praeparari et insperatae laetitiae[8].

l. 100. *For* incolae Italiae, *read* incolae Latiales[9].

l. 121. *For* intellectu, *read* (*with MS.*) intellecta[10].

l. 129. *For* hospitalitas a Phrygibus denegata, *read* hospitalitas est a P. derogata[11].

[1] See note on title of *Epist.* VII, above.

[2] I have found no other instance of *pernoctitare*, but the MS. reading *pernotitauimus* obviously is intended for *pernoctitavimus*; cf. *letitantis* for *lectitantis* at the beginning of the second Battifolle letter (see above, p. 20). Frequentative forms are common in medieval texts; numbers of examples are to be found in the *Catholicon*.

[3] *Applaudere* in the sense of 'to applaud' is regularly constructed with the accusative.

[4] *Initibus* seems preferable to *initiis*, which, as a 'facilior lectio,' would naturally tend to displace the rarer word.

[5] For this use of *quia* in place of *quod*, cf. *Mon.* III, 9, ll. 116—17: 'Quum Petrus audivisset quia Dominus esset'; and *Matt.* x, 34 (quoted in *Mon.* III, 9, ll. 132—3): 'Nolite arbitrari quia pacem venerim mittere in terram' (Dante reads 'veni'); and Peter Damian, *De Quadragesima* (Cap. ii): 'Audistis quia scripsit haec Moyses...?'

[6] The hiatus here, and in the following passages, is supplied by Barbi (in his article on Scartazzini's *Dantologia* in *Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.* N.S. II, p. 23, note) from *Cod. S. Pantaleo* 8, in the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele at Rome.

[7] As supplied by Barbi (*loc. cit.*).

[8] As supplied by Barbi (*loc. cit.*)—*Cod. S. Pantaleo* 8 reads *insperare*, an obvious error for *insperate* (i.e. *insperatae*). In the Vatican MS. *erate* (which Torri took to represent *oratae*) is evidently the second half of a word, of which the beginning was undecipherable by the copyist. *Insperatae*, supported as it is by the *disperata* of the Italian translation, is undoubtedly the correct reading.

[9] As supplied by Barbi (*loc. cit.*). For the use of *Latialis* in the sense of 'Italian,' cf. 'Latiale caput' (of Rome) in *Epist.* VIII, l. 150.

[10] *Intellecta*, which was suggested many years ago by Boehmer (see *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Dante-Gesellschaft*, I, 396), is obviously right, the passage being an almost *verbatim* quotation from the Vulgate: 'Invisibilia enim ipsius, a creatura mundi, per ea quae facta sunt, intellecta, conspiciuntur' (*Rom.* I, 20). Part of the same passage, as Boehmer points out, is quoted by Dante in the *De Monarchia*: 'Invisibilia Dei, per ea quae facta sunt, intellecta conspiciuntur' (II, 2, ll. 72—3).

[11] It is difficult to decide whether the *deregata* of the MS. stands for *denegata* or *derogata* (as read by Torri). The weight of evidence is in favour of the former (e.g.

l. 145. *For* procedendo, *read* (*with MS.*) praecedentia.

ll. 146—7. *For* pacem videns annorum duodecim orbem totaliter amplexatam, *read* (*with MS.*) pace videlicet a. d. o. t. amplexata.

l. 149. *For* quae sui syllogizatoris faciem Dei filium...ostendit, *read* qua sui s. facies, Dei filius...ostenditur[1].

l. 153. *For* dixit, *read* (*with MS. and Frat.*) duxit.

l. 164. *For* ac, *read* (*with MS.*) et.

Whether all the emendations (to the number of between eighty and ninety) which have been proposed in the foregoing study find acceptance or not, it is abundantly evident that the printed text of the letters of Dante contained in the Vatican MS., as represented in the editions of Fraticelli and Giuliani, and in the Oxford Dante, is in need of very considerable revision.

PAGET TOYNBEE.

FIVEWAYS, BURNHAM, BUCKS.

Since the above article was printed I have received a photographic reproduction of the text of *Epistles* V and VII as contained in *Cod. S. Pantaleo* 8 in the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele at Rome (see above, pp. 4, 32). I hope to print a supplementary article dealing with the S. Pantaleo text of these two letters in a subsequent number of the *Review*.

Torricelli reads *denegata*, and the Italian translation has *negata*), but it is not clear to what denial of hospitality to the Greeks by the Trojans the reference could be. (Wicksteed thinks the allusion is to the repulse of the Argonauts from the Simois by Laomedon, and the subsequent sacking of Troy by Hercules, and the rape of Laomedon's daughter, Hesione, followed by the rape of Helen in reprisal.) On the other hand, if *derogata* be read, the reference to the abuse of the hospitality of Menelaus by Paris, and the rape of Helen, would be obvious; while it is more likely that *denegata*, as 'facilior lectio,' should have been substituted by a copyist for *derogata*, than that the converse should have been the case.

[1] The combination of Torricelli's *syllogizatoris facies*, *Dei filius*, with the *ostenditur* of the Vatican MS., and the consequent necessary substitution of *qua* for *quae*, seems to afford a more satisfactory reading than that of the Oxford text.

DONNE'S SERMONS, AND THEIR RELATION TO HIS POETRY.

THE revival of interest in Donne's poetry which has occurred in recent years does not seem to have extended to his prose works. While his poems have been reprinted in excellent modern editions, the prose works are accessible only in their original seventeenth-century editions, or in Alford's so-called *Works of Donne* (1839)—a very unsatisfactory reprint with numerous omissions.

Yet these prose writings of Donne are valuable both in themselves, and in relation to his other works. Donne's intense individuality is evident in everything he produced, and the same characteristics that are stamped on his early love-poems and satires, as well as on the *Holy Sonnets* of his more sober middle life, are found also in all his prose works, from the clever but flippant *Paradoxes and Problems* or *Ignatius his Conclave* to the stately magnificence of his last sermons. It is true that the greater number of his poems belong to the emphatically unregenerate 'Jack Donne' of his youth, whilst the reverend and saintly Dr Donne of later years was responsible for most of the prose works, but the change in his life produced an alteration in the matter only, not the style, of his work. Whether as a poet he addressed the 'profane mistresses' of his youth, or the Christ of his later devotion, whether in prose he lightly discussed the possibility of women possessing a soul, or preached 'like an angel from a cloud' on righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, he shewed always the same agility of intellect, the same intensity of imagination. The ideas that dominate his poetry are never absent from his prose work, though the light in which they are viewed may be of a different colour. The delight in paradox, and in the 'discovery of occult resemblances in things apparently unlike,' the somewhat cynical attitude towards women, the tendency to casuistry, above all the irresistible attraction towards the idea of death—these are the elements of Donne's prose work as of his poetry.

By far the larger part of this prose is contained in the volumes of sermons which were issued posthumously in 1640, 1649, and 166$\frac{0}{1}$. The remainder consists of *Pseudo-Martyr*, a controversial treatise published in 1610, designed to induce Roman Catholics to take the Oath of Allegiance; *Ignatius his Conclave*, a bitter little satire against the Jesuits, which appeared in 1611; *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions and Several Steps in my Sickness*, a curious record of Donne's illness in the winter of 1623, which was published early in 1624; and three works which were not published till after Donne's death, though they were composed comparatively early in his career—viz. *Iuvenilia*, published 1633, reprinted as *Paradoxes, Problems, Essays, Characters* in 1652[1], *Biathanatos*, published 1644, and *Essays in Divinity*, published 1651. There are also a few scattered sermons, published during Donne's lifetime and not reprinted in the posthumous collected editions.

A certain interest attaches itself to these minor prose works by reason of their reflection of various aspects of Donne's mind, but it is only in the *LXXX Sermons* of 1640 and the two succeeding volumes that his full powers as a prose-writer are displayed. It is true that these sermons suffer from the usual defects of seventeenth-century discourses; they are too long, they are based on a too literal interpretation of the Scriptures, their constant appeals to the Fathers become wearisome, and much of their argument seems to us mere verbal quibbling. In addition, they have faults of their own which are characteristic of Donne's work as a whole—errors of taste caused by a love of too ingenious conceits, an excessive inclination to paradox, and a morbid pre-occupation with the idea of death and its accompanying horrors. Yet when all these faults are admitted, the fact remains that these sermons are valuable not only for the light they throw on Donne's strangely fascinating character, but also for their intrinsic literary merits. Scattered broadcast throughout them are felicitous short phrases such as 'Certainly he that loves not the Militant Church, hath but a faint faith in his interest in the Triumphant[2],' or, at somewhat greater length, 'From that inglorious drop of rain, that falls into the dust, and rises no more, to those glorious Saints who shall rise from the dust, and fall no more, but, as they arise at once to the fulness of

[1] The edition of 1652 contains additional matter, of which some is certainly spurious.

[2] 'Preached at St Paul's upon Christmas Day, 1621.' Vol. II, 36, p. 330. As there is at present no critical edition of the prose works, reference is made, in each instance, to the first edition. The sermons are assigned to their volume (LXXX, 1640, being referred to as Vol. I; L, 1649, as II; XXVI, 166$\frac{0}{1}$, as III), the number of each sermon is then mentioned, and then the page. The spelling alone is modernised, in order to agree with the quotations from the poems, which are taken from the edition by E. K. Chambers, 1896.

Essential joy, so arise daily in accidential joys, all are the children of God, and all alike of kin to us[1],' whilst at times Donne's style exhibits a dignity and beauty that have seldom been surpassed in English prose.

God made Sun and Moon to distinguish seasons, and day and night, and we cannot have the fruits of the earth but in their seasons: But God hath made no decree to distinguish the seasons of his mercies; in Paradise, the fruits were ripe, the first minute, and in heaven it is always Autumn, his mercies are ever in their maturity....He brought light out of darkness, not out of a lesser light; he can bring thy Summer out of Winter, though thou have no Spring; though in the ways of fortune, or understanding, or conscience, thou have been benighted till now, wintred and frozen, clouded and eclipsed, damped and benumbed, smothered and stupefied till now, now God comes to thee, not as in the dawning of the day, not as in the bud of the spring, but as the Sun at noon to illustrate all shadows, as the sheaves in harvest, to fill all penuries, all occasions invite his mercies, and all times are his seasons[2].

Or,

We think not a friend lost, because he is gone into another room, nor because he is gone into another Land; and into another world, no man is gone; for that Heaven, which God created, and this world, is all one world. If I had fixed a Son in Court, or married a daughter into a plentiful Fortune, I were satisfied for that son and that daughter. Shall I not be so, when the King of Heaven hath taken that son to himself, and married himself to that daughter, for ever[3]?

Or again,

Divers men may walk by the Sea-side, and the same beams of the Sun giving light to them all, one gathereth by the benefit of that light pebbles, or speckled shells, for curious vanity, and another gathers precious Pearl, or medicinal Amber, by the same light....If thou canst take this light of reason that is in thee, this poor snuff, that is almost out in thee, thy faint and dim knowledge of God, that riseth out of this light of nature, if thou canst in those embers, those cold ashes, find out one small coal, and wilt take the pains to kneel down, and blow that coal with thy devout Prayers, and light thee a little candle, (a desire to read that book, which they call the Scriptures, and the Gospel, and the Word of God;) If with that little candle thou canst creep humbly into low and poor places, if thou canst find thy Saviour in a Manger, and in his swathing clouts, in his humiliation, and bless God for that beginning...thou shalt never envy the lustre and glory of the great lights of worldly men...thou shalt see, that thou by thy small light hast gathered Pearl and Amber, and they by their great lights nothing but shells and pebbles; they have determined the light of nature, upon the book of nature, this world, and thou hast carried the light of nature higher, thy natural reason, and even human arguments, have brought thee to read the Scriptures, and to that love, God hath set to the seal of faith. Their light shall set at noon; even in their height, some heavy cross shall cast a damp upon their soul, and cut off all their succours, and divest them of all comforts, and thy light shall grow up, from a fair hope, to a modest assurance and infallibility, that that light shall never go out, nor the works of darkness, nor the Prince of darkness ever prevail upon thee, but as thy light of reason is exalted by faith here, so thy light of faith shall be exalted into the light of glory, and fruition in the Kingdom of heaven[4].

[1] 'Preached at St Paul's Cross, 6 May 1627,' II, 41, p. 376.
[2] 'Preached at Paul's, upon Christmas Day, in the Evening, 1624,' I, 2, p. 13.
[3] 'Preached at St Paul's, upon Easter Day, 1627,' I, 22, p. 220.
[4] 'Preached at St Paul's, upon Christmas Day, 1621,' II, 36, pp. 325—327.

There are very few of the Sermons that do not contain at least one striking and impressive passage of this kind, and even the dreariest controversial arguments are lit up here and there by flashes of inspiration. Moreover the sanity and broad-mindedness of these discourses contrasts favourably with the tone of most of the theological literature of the time. Donne is curiously modern in some of the positions he takes up, e.g. with regard to miracles, heaven and hell, the relation of faith and reason. He says vigorously, 'It is but a slack opinion, it is not Belief, that is not grounded upon reason....Let no man think that God hath given him so much ease here, as to save him by believing he knoweth not what, or why. Knowledge cannot save us, but we cannot be saved without Knowledge; Faith is not on this side Knowledge, but beyond it; we must necessarily come to Knowledge first, though we must not stay at it, when we are come thither[1].'

And again in a passage that almost reminds us of Bunyan in its homely imagery, 'Implicit believers, ignorant believers, the adversary may swallow; but the understanding believer, he must chaw, and pick bones, before he come to assimilate him, and make him like himself[2].'

There is common-sense with a touch of humour in his treatment of Puritan extravagances:

> Humiliation is the beginning of sanctification; and as without this, without holiness, no man shall see God, though he pore whole nights upon the Bible; so without that, without humility, no man shall hear God speak to his soul, though he hear three two-hours Sermons every day[3].

And with regard to extempore preaching:

> We have here [i.e. in the Penitent Thief] one example of an extemporal Sermon; this Thief had premeditated nothing. But he is no more a precedent for extemporal preaching, than he is for stealing. He was a Thief before, and he was an extemporal preacher at last; but he teaches nobody else to be either[4].

It is, however, in their relation to his poems that perhaps the chief interest of Donne's prose works lies. There are in the sermons many passages which are strongly reminiscent of the language of the poems. Thus the famous comparison of the circle made by the pair of compasses in the 'Valediction Forbidding Mourning' re-appears in the 'Sermon preached at the Earl of Bridgewater's House' in 1627, though the application of the comparison is of a different nature. The wording of the idea is so similar that both passages may be quoted:

[1] 'Preached at St Paul's, upon Christmas Day, 1621,' II, 36, p. 325.
[2] 'Preached at St Paul's, in the Evening, upon Easter Day, 1623,' I, 18, p. 178.
[3] 'Preached upon Christmas Day,' I, 7, p. 73 (wrongly numbered as 75 in the edition of 1640).
[4] 'A Lent Sermon preached at Whitehall, February 20, 1617,' III, 1, p. 8.

If they be two, they are two so
As stiff twin compasses are two;
Thy soul, the fix'd foot, makes no show
To move, but doth, if th' other do.

And though it in the centre sit,
Yet, when the other far doth roam,
It leans, and hearkens after it,
And grows erect, as that comes home.

Such wilt thou be to me, who must
Like th' other foot, obliquely run;
Thy firmness makes my circle just,
And makes me end where I begun.

First then, Christ establishes a Resurrection, a Resurrection there shall be, for that makes up God's circle. The Body of Man was the first point that the foot of God's Compass was upon: first, he created the body of Adam: and then he carries his compass round, and shuts up where he began, he ends with the Body of Man again in the glorification thereof in the Resurrection[1].

The opening lines of the 'Obsequies of the Lord Harrington, Brother to the Countess of Bedford':

Fair soul which was, not only as all souls be,
Then when thou wast infusèd, harmony,
But didst continue so; and now dost bear
A part in God's great organ, this whole sphere

find their echo in the Sermon 'Preached at Paul's Cross to the Lords of the Council and other Honourable Persons, March 24, 1616':

Is the world a great and harmonious Organ, where all parts are played, and all play parts; and must thou only sit idle and hear it[2]?

In the greater number of such cases, the thought had been already expressed by Donne in poetry, before it found a way into his prose, so that, as Professor Saintsbury says, he 'did but trans-prose his verse, and trans-hallow his profanities,' but in one case, poem and sermon were written on the same occasion, and in one or two others, the sermon preceded the poem. The 'Sermon of Valediction at My Going into Germany, at Lincoln's Inn, April 18, 1619' and the 'Hymn to Christ, at the Author's Last Going into Germany,' give us the simultaneous outpouring of Donne's soul in prose and in verse, and the comparison of the two modes of expression makes an interesting study. It is impossible here to quote more than one short passage from each:

In my long absence, and far distance from hence, remember me, as I shall do you, in the ears of that God, to whom the farthest East, and the farthest West are but as the right and left ear in one of us....Remember me thus, you that stay in this Kingdom of peace, where no sword is drawn, but the sword of Justice, as I shall remember you in those Kingdoms, where ambition on one side, and a necessary defence from unjust persecution on the other side hath drawn many swords; and

[1] II, 1, p. 3.

[2] III, 24, p. 343.

Christ Jesus remember us all in his Kingdom, to which, though we must sail through a sea, it is the sea of his blood, where no soul suffers shipwreck; though we must be blown with strange winds, with sighs and groans for our sins, yet it is the Spirit of God that blows all this wind, and shall blow away all contrary winds of diffidence or distrust in God's mercy[1].

In what torn ship so ever I embark,
That ship shall be my emblem of Thy ark;
What sea soever swallow me, that flood
Shall be to me an emblem of Thy blood;
Though Thou with clouds of anger do disguise
Thy face, yet through that mask I know those eyes,
Which, though they turn away sometimes,
They never will despise.

I sacrifice this island unto Thee,
And all whom I love there, and who love me;
When I have put our seas 'twixt them and me
Put Thou Thy seas betwixt my sins and Thee.
As the tree's sap doth seek the root below
In winter, in my winter now I go,
Where none but Thee, the eternal root
Of true love, I may know.

Some of the lines on 'A Sheaf of Snakes used heretofore to be my Seal, the crest of our poor Family' are a versification of the ideas which Donne had previously expressed in the 'Anniversary Sermon preached at St Dunstan's[2]' on the curse pronounced on the Serpent, 'And dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life.'

Again, if the 'Hymn to God, my God, in my Sickness' was written, as Walton says, on Donne's death-bed, it contains imagery which Donne had already employed in the 'Sermon Preached upon Easter Day, 1629.' The poem runs thus:

Whilst my physicians by their love are grown
Cosmographers, and I their map, who lie
Flat on this bed, that by them may be shown
That this is my south-west discovery,
Per fretum febris, by these straits to die;

I joy that in these straits I see my west;
For, though these currents yield return to none,
What shall my west hurt me? As west and east
In all flat maps—and I am one—are one,
So death doth touch the resurrection.

Is the Pacific sea my home? Or are
The eastern riches? Is Jerusalem?
Anyan, and Magellan, and Gibraltar[3],
All straits, and none but straits are ways to them
Whether where Japhet dwelt, or Cham, or Shem.

[1] III, 19, pp. 280, 281.
[2] II, pp. 439—445.
[3] Chambers' edition contains a note of interrogation here, but Prof. H. J. Grierson tells me that the true reading should be a comma.

The sermon contains this passage:

> Who ever amongst our Fathers, thought of any other way to the Moluccas, or to China, than by the Promontory of Good Hope? Yet another way opened itself to Magellan; a Strait, it is true; but yet a way thither; and who knows yet, whether there may not be a North-East, and a North-West way thither, besides? Go thou to heaven, in an humble thankfulness to God, and holy cheerfulness, in that way that God hath manifested to thee; and do not pronounce too bitterly, too desperately that every man is in an error, that thinks not just as thou thinkest, or in no way that is not in thy way[1].

Instances of verbal correspondence between the poems and prose works might easily be multiplied, but the correspondence of ideas is more important. Certain characteristic features of the poems, such as the anti-chivalrous attitude towards woman, and the stress laid on the connection between body and soul, are almost equally conspicuous in the prose works. Donne's revolt against the poetical conventions of his day had been nowhere more evident than in his repudiation of the Petrarchian woman-worship that still dominated the Elizabethan sonneteers, and his cynical estimate of womankind.

The feeling expressed in

> Hope not for mind in women; at their best
> Sweetness and wit, they are but mummy possess'd[2].

and

> Though she were true when you met her,
> And last till you write your letter,
> Yet she
> Will be
> False, ere I come, to two or three[3].

had been the key-note of much of his love-poetry, and it is equally evident in the *Paradoxes and Problems*. The problem 'Why hath the Common Opinion afforded Women Souls?' gives him an opportunity for much satire. Among the reasons suggested—all of them unfavourable to women—are the characteristic ones,

> Have they so many advantages and means to hurt us (for, ever their loving destroyed us) that we dare not displease them, but give them what they will?...Or perchance because the Devil (who is all soul) doth most mischief, and for convenience and proportion, because they would come nearer him, we allow them some souls[4].

In later years Donne treated this subject with less levity. In the Sermon preached on the last Easter Day of his life, there is a reference which can hardly be disputed to his own early work:

[1] I, 24, p. 241.
[2] 'Love's Alchemy,' ll. 23, 24. (I have not followed Chambers' punctuation here, as it causes unnecessary difficulty.)
[3] Song, 'Go and catch a falling star,' ll. 23—27.
[4] *Juvenilia*, Problem VI.

For, howsoever some men out of a petulancy and wantonness of wit, and out of the extravagancy of paradoxes, and such singularities, have called the faculties, and abilities of women in question, even in the root thereof, in the reasonable and immortal soul, yet that one thing alone hath been enough to create a doubt, (almost an assurance in the negative) whether S. Ambrose's Commentaries upon the Epistles of St Paul be truly his or no, that in that book there is a doubt made, whether the woman were created according to God's Image...No author of gravity, of piety, of conversation in the Scriptures could admit that doubt, whether women were created in the Image of God, that is, in possession of a reasonable and an immortal soul.... Woman, as well as man, was made after the Image of God, in the Creation; and in the Resurrection, when we shall rise such as we were here, her sex shall not diminish her glory[1].

Yet in spite of this repudiation of his former heresy, it is clear from many of the Sermons that Donne held firm his belief in the inferiority of woman. 'The sphere of our loves is sublunary, upon things naturally inferior to ourselves,' was still his conviction. The various marriage sermons could hardly have been very pleasant hearing for any bride who possessed the slightest degree of spirit. 'She is but *Adjutorium*, but a Help: and nobody values his staff as he does his legs[2]....'

The *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions* are equally uncomplimentary. 'God saw that Man needed a Helper, if he should be well, but to make Woman ill, the Devil saw, that there needed no third[3].'

Another characteristic idea of the poems is that of the importance of the body to the soul. This idea is apparent in the treatment of the paradox, 'That the gifts of the Body are better than those of the Mind[4],' which is elaborated in *Juvenilia*. In later life it served to check Donne's growing austerity, and counteracted to some extent his tendency to consider the body as a prison from which death alone could give release. In the 'Litany' in the *Divine Poems* he prays, 'From thinking us all soul, neglecting thus Our mutual duties, Lord, deliver us[5],'—lines which find a parallel in a passage in one of the Sermons:

Man is not all soul, but a body too; and, as God hath married them together in thee, so hath he commanded them mutual duties towards one another; and God allows us large uses of temporal blessings, and of recreations too[6].

And again, in a loftier strain,

And therefore be content to wonder at this, That God would have such a care to dignify, and to crown, and to associate to his own everlasting presence, the body of man....Marvel at this, at the wonderful love of God to the body of man, and thou wilt favour it so, as not to macerate thine own body, with uncommanded and

1 'Preached at St Paul's, upon Easter Day, 1630,' I, 25, pp. 242, 243.
2 'Preached at a Marriage,' II, 2, p. 14.
3 *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions*, 21, Meditation.
4 *Juvenilia*, Paradox XI.
5 'Litany,' ll. 143, 144.
6 'Preached at St Paul's, 13 Oct., 1622,' II, 38, p. 351.

inhuman flagellations, and whippings, nor afflict their bodies, who are in thy charge, with inordinate labour; thou wilt not dishonour this body, as it is Christ's body, nor deform it, as it is thine own, with intemperance, but thou wilt behave thyself towards it so, as towards one, whom it hath pleased the King to honour, with a resurrection...and not to defer that resurrection long[1].

The 'metaphysical wit' of the poems is almost equally evident in the Sermons. Sometimes the simile employed, though unexpected, has a certain amount of force, as in the comparison of a good man's life to an engraving:

Be pleased to remember that those Pictures which are delivered in a minute, from a print upon a paper, had many days, weeks, Months time for the graving of these Pictures in the Copper; So this Picture of that dying Man, that dies in Christ, that dies the death of the Righteous, that embraces Death as a Sleep, was graving all his life; All his public actions were the lights, and all his private the shadows of this Picture[2].

Frequently, however, as in the poems, it is merely ingenious and fantastic.

He [God] purges us by his sunshine, by his temporal blessings; for, as the greatest globes of gold lie nearest the face and top of the earth, where they have received the best concoction from the heat of the sun; so certainly, in reason, they who have had God's continual sun-shine upon them, in a prosperous fortune, should have received the best concoction, the best digestion of the testimonies of his love, and consequently be the purer, and the more refined metal[3].

Deeper even than the correspondence in thought and expression lies the essential connection of poems and prose works. It is the 'quintessenced, passionate, melancholy imagination' of Donne, which pervades alike his poetry and his prose, and finds in both its chief delight in the contemplation of Love and Death, that forms the real link between the two modes of expression. Donne himself never tries to make his hearers forget that the saint of to-day is one with the sinner of yesterday. When he preached on the blessedness of the pure in heart, he closed his sermon with these words:

In seeing God, we shall see all that concerns us, and see it always; no night to determine that day, no cloud to overcast it. We end all, with St Augustine's devout exclamation...Glorious God, what kind of eyes shall they be!...How bright eyes, and how well set!...How strong eyes, and how durable!...What quality, what value, what name shall we give to those eyes?...I would say something of the beauty and glory of these eyes, and can find no words, but such as I myself have misused in lower things. Our best expressing of it, is to express a desire to come to it, for there only we shall learn what to call it. That so, we may go the Apostle's way, to his end, That being made free from sin, and become servants to God, we may have our fruit unto holiness, and then, the End, life everlasting[4].

[1] 'Preached at St Paul's, in the Evening, upon Easter Day, 1625,' I, 20, pp. 194, 197.
[2] 'Preached at Whitehall, Feb. 29, 1627' [162$\frac{7}{8}$], III, 15, p. 218.
[3] 'Preached at Greenwich, April 30, 1615,' III, 11, p. 164.
[4] 'Preached on Candlemas Day,' I, 12, p. 123.

There is a delightfully homely passage in the sermon preached on the last Easter but one of his life, that well expresses his humility and sincerity:

> I doubt not of mine own salvation; and in whom can I have so much occasion of doubt, as in myself? When I come to heaven, shall I be able to say to any there, Lord! how got you hither? Was any man less likely to come thither than I?[1]

The reality of Donne's change of heart only heightens by contrast the unchanged character of his mind. The object of desire may have altered, the thought of death may be accompanied, and at times swallowed up in, the contemplation of future glory, but the imagination and passion remained and gave their own peculiar melancholy and intensity to all Donne's work. From his earliest days Donne had dwelt, with a certain morbidness of fancy, on mortality and all its attendant circumstances. In one of his best-known poems he had spoken of the opening of his own grave, and the discovery of 'A bracelet of bright hair about the bone.' 'When I am dead' is the note that recurs again and again throughout the Songs and Sonnets, and in the *Anatomy of the World* Death was the theme that called forth all his powers. In the prose works this tendency to insist on the idea of death is equally evident. One of the early 'Paradoxes' propounded the theory 'That all things kill themselves,' and *Biathanatos* was written to justify Donne's own inclination towards the idea of suicide. The Sermons treat this theme continually, and the last of Donne's great discourses was that famous 'Death's Duel' that took for its motto 'Unto God the Lord belong the issues from death.'

This contemplation of death assumes a variety of forms. Sometimes it treats the physical aspect—corruption and decay—and is merely horrible and repulsive.

Sometimes it is the approach of death that is depicted, as in the Sermon preached before the Prince and Princess Palatine (June 16, 1619):

> The sun is setting to thee, and that for ever; thy houses and furnitures, thy gardens and orchards, thy titles and offices, thy wife and children are departing from thee, and that for ever; a cloud of faintness is come over thine eyes, and a cloud of sorrow over all theirs; when his hand that loves thee best hangs tremblingly over thee to close thine eyes, *Ecce Salvator tuus venit*, behold then a new light, thy Saviour's hand shall open thine eyes, and in his light thou shalt see light; and thus shalt see, that though in the eyes of men thou lie upon that bed, as a Statue on a Tomb, yet in the eyes of God, thou standest as a Colossus, one foot in one, another in another land; one foot in the grave, but the other in heaven; one hand in the womb of the earth, and the other in Abraham's bosom: and then *vere prope*,

[1] 'Preached upon Easter Day, 1629,' I, 24, p. 241.

salvation is truly near thee, and nearer than when thou believedst, which is our last word[1].

The last sentence of this passage suggests an aspect of death that was ever present to Donne's mind—Death as the Deliverer. To him life was but a gradual death, and death the gate to that which alone could truly be called life. He possessed in full measure the neurotic temperament which, though it experiences moments of the most exquisite bliss, yet too often finds life an intolerable burden. In the *Anatomy of the World* (First Anniversary, ll. 91–94), he had declared:

> There is no health; physicians say that we,
> At best, enjoy but a neutrality.
> And can there be worse sickness than to know
> That we are never well, nor can be so?

and in the Sermon preached on Easter Day, 1627, he spoke of himself as 'a volume of diseases bound up together[2].'

In the Sermon preached on Christmas Day, 1626, there is a significant passage:

> My body is my prison; and I would be so obedient to the Law, as not to break prison; I would not hasten my death by starving, or macerating this body: But if this prison be burnt down with continual fevers, or blown down with continual vapours, would any man be so in love with that ground upon which that prison stood, as to desire rather to stay there, than to go home[3].

We know from *Biathanatos* that Donne had often contemplated the possibility of suicide[4], and in that work he had tried to demonstrate 'that Self-Homicide is not so naturally sin that it may never be otherwise.' *Biathanatos* was written, however, comparatively early, and it is clear from passages in the Divine Poems and the Sermons, that in later life Donne decided that, however desirable death might be, a man was not justified in inflicting it upon himself.

In the 'Litany' he prays to Christ:

> And since Thou so desirously
> Didst long to die, that long before Thou couldst,
> And long since Thou no more couldst die,
> Thou in Thy scatter'd mystic body wouldst
> In Abel die, and ever since
> In Thine; let their blood come
> To beg for us a discreet patience
> Of death, or of worse life; for O, to some
> Not to be martyrs, is a martyrdom.

[1] III, 20, p. 295. (The numbering of the pages in Vol. III is inaccurate, and nos. 285–296 are used twice. This passage occurs on the earlier of the two pages numbered as 295.)

[2] I, 22, p. 223.

[3] I, 4, p. 38.

[4] 'Whensoever any affliction assails me, methinks I have the keys of my prison in mine own hand, and no remedy presents itself so soon to my heart, as mine own sword.' *Biathanatos*, p. 18.

And in the Sermon on Easter Day, 1624, he exhorts his hearers:

If thou desire this first Resurrection in the third acceptation, as St Paul did, To be dissolved, and to be with Christ, go Christ's way to that also. He desired that glory that thou doest; and he could have laid down his soul when he would; but he staid his hour, says the Gospel....Thou hast no such power of thine own soul and life, not for the time, not for the means of coming to this first Resurrection by death: Stay therefore patiently, stay cheerfully God's leisure till he call; but not so over-cheerfully, as to be loath to go when he calls[1].

Yet this gloomy attitude towards the mysteries of life and death represents only one side of Donne's complex nature. In spite of his constitutional melancholy, there was in him an intense capacity for delight which shewed itself in the passion of his love-poems, and is still evident in the later prose works; but whereas Love and Death had been the themes of his earlier work, the order is now rather Death and Love. Death has become the gate of Life, the way that leads to the goal of all desire. Like Sidney, Donne has bidden farewell to the love that reacheth but to dust, and has welcomed instead the eternal love that cannot change nor die. The passion remains, but it is purified and exalted.

Bring therefore your Ambition to that bent, to covet a place in the kingdom of heaven, bring your anger to flow into zeal, bring your love to enamour you of that face, which is fairer than the children of men, that face, on which the Angels desire to look, Christ Jesus[2].

Love is not despised; it is 'the richest mantle, the noblest affection, that the nature of man hath[3],' but it cannot find satisfaction in the things of space and time. He recalls the old joys of earthly passion and finds them too transitory.

They are joys that come seldom, and stay but a little while when they come. Call it joy, to have had that thou lovest, in thine eye, or in thy arms, remember what oaths, what false oaths, it did cost thee before it came to that! And where is that joy now, is there a *semper* in that? Call it joy to have had him whom thou hatest, in thine hands or under thy feet, what ignoble disguises to that man, what servile observations of some greater, than either you, or he, did that cost you before you brought him into your power? and where is that joy, if a Funeral or a bloody conscience benight it?

And then he turns to the joy of the angelic host. 'To take away all wonder, it is added, the Lord is in the midst of them, and then, be what they will, they must rejoice; For if he be with them they are with him, and he is Joy[4].'

[1] I, 19, pp. 191, 192.
[2] 'Preached at St Paul's, 13 Oct. 1622,' II, 38, p. 352.
[3] 'Preached at Paul's Cross...March 24, 1616,' III, 24, p. 335.
[4] 'A Sermon preached in Saint Dunstan's,' II, 50, p. 472.

All love but the love of God 'admits satiety.' 'The highest degree of other love is the love of woman: which love, when it is rightly placed upon one woman, it is dignified by the Apostle with the highest comparison, Husbands love your wives, as Christ loved his Church[1].' Yet even this love finds disappointment. 'The sphere of our loves is sublunary, upon things naturally inferior to ourselves[2].' Donne had sung often of the fleeting nature of earthly love; neither in woman, nor in himself, had he hoped to find constancy. He had found it at last in his wife, but death had taken her from him. Now he yearns for a love that shall never lose its object.

> Even love itself, as noble a passion as it is, is but a pain, except we enjoy that we love; and therefore another branch of the School, with their Aureolus, place this blessedness, this union of our souls with God, *in gaudio*, in our joy, that is, in our enjoying of God. In this world we enjoy nothing; enjoying presumes perpetuity; and here, all things are fluid, transitory: There I shall enjoy, and possess for ever, God himself[3].

He who sees, even from afar, the light of this glory, cannot live wholly in darkness, and thus Donne insists that the joys of heaven must begin already on earth.

> Man passes not from the miseries of this life, to the joys of Heaven, but by joy in this life too; for he that feels no joy here, shall find none hereafter[4].
>
> The brightest noon had a faint twilight, and break of day; the sight of God which we shall have in heaven, must have a *Diluculum*, a break of day here; if we will see his face there, we must see it in some beams here[5].

And the vision brings not only joy, but also purification; as ever, he that hath this hope in Him purifieth himself even as also He is pure; and thus we find Donne preaching from two texts that must have sounded somewhat strange from his lips: 'Rejoice evermore,' and 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.' The two ideas are united in a noble passage in the sermon that has just been quoted:

> The pure in heart are blessed already, not only comparatively, that they are in a better way of Blessedness, than others are, but actually in a present possession of it: for this world and the next world, are not to the pure in heart two houses, but two rooms, a Gallery to pass through, and a Lodging to rest in, in the same House, which are both under one roof, Christ Jesus; the Militant and the Triumphant are not two Churches, but this the Porch, and that the Chancel of the same Church, which are under one Head, Christ Jesus; so the Joy, and the sense of Salvation, which the pure in heart have here, is not a joy severed from the Joy of Heaven, but a Joy that begins in us here, and continues, and accompanies us thither, and there

[1] 'Preached at Paul's Cross...March 24, 1616,' III, 24, p. 336.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 337.
[3] 'Preached at St Paul's Cross, November 22, 1629,' II, 44, p. 421.
[4] 'Preached in St Dunstan's,' II, 50, p. 466.
[5] 'Preached on Candlemas Day,' I, 12, p. 122.

flows on, and dilutes itself to an infinite expansion...though the fulness of the glory thereof be reserved to that which is expressed in the last branch, *Videbunt Deum*, They shall see God[1].

Donne had long desired that final consummation, when 'God's great Venite' should 'change the song.' In the *Anatomy of the World* he had cried:

> Thirst for that time, O my insatiate soul,
> And serve thy thirst with God's safe-sealing bowl;
> Be thirsty still, and drink still till thou go
> To th' only health,

but as he grows older there flames higher in him the love that shall find full satisfaction only in that Beatific Vision for which his whole soul yearns with unquenchable desire. Again and again he turns to this theme, but words fail him as he approaches it.

To this light of glory, the light of honour is but a glow-worm; and majesty itself but a twilight; the Cherubims and Seraphims are but Candles; and that Gospel itself, which the Apostle calls the glorious Gospel, but a Star of the least magnitude. And if I cannot tell, what to call this light, by which I shall see it, what shall I call that which I shall see by it, The Essence of God himself[2]?

It is time to end; but as long as the glass hath a gasp, as long as I have one, I would breathe in this air, in this perfume, in this breath of heaven, the contemplation of this Joy....Joy in this life...is called meat...Joy in the next life...is called drink...but the overflowing, the *Ebrietas animae*, that is reserved to the last time, when our bodies as well as our souls, shall enter into the participation of it; Where, when we shall love everyone, as well as our selves, and so have that Joy of our own salvation multiplied by that number, we shall have that Joy so many times over, as there shall be souls saved, because we love them as our selves, how infinitely shall this Joy be enlarged in loving God, so far above our selves, and all them[3].

Blessedness itself, is God himself; our blessedness is our possession, our union with God[4].

EVELYN M. SPEARING.

CAMBRIDGE.

[1] 'Preached on Candlemas Day,' I, 12, p. 119.
[2] 'Preached at St Paul's for Easter Day, 1628,' I, 23, p. 231.
[3] 'Preached in St Dunstan's,' II, 50, pp. 473, 474.
[4] 'Preached at St Paul's Cross, Nov. 22, 1629,' II, 44, p. 421.

SHELLEY'S *ZASTROZZI* AND *ST IRVYNE.*

THE long disregarded romances of Shelley come under a new light in Dr A. H. Koszul's brilliant book, *La Jeunesse de Shelley* (Paris, 1910), which shows how much they foreshadow of the poet's later self—his bias for the extremes of energy, sensibility, and passion, his heresy and mysticism. In the *Revue Germanique* for March, 1905 the same scholar indicates the main source of the novels in Mrs Byrne's *Zofloya or The Moor*, as well as some minor influence from Regnault-Warin's *La Caverne de Strozzi* (Paris, 1798). To this secondary source I would add others. Whatever other models Mrs Byrne used, her main motives had been suggested in two romances by English forerunners, and Shelley had these in mind. Moreover *St Irvyne* can only be construed if we take into consideration also Godwin's *St Leon.*

In 1795 Lewis's *Ambrosio, or The Monk*[1] brought in 'the intense school' of Gothic fiction with its sexual passion, bloodshed, and demonology. Ambrosio, an Abbot of Madrid, is tempted by a demon in woman's form. Before he yields there is a long spell of fencing between his conscience and his temptress (Matilda). (1) She has him bitten by a serpent, and as he lies on the sick bed, seemingly, but not really, asleep, bends over him and gives utterance to her passion (I, ii, 3 vol. edition, 1798). She nurses him untiringly, and then, sickening with poison sucked from his wound, refuses to employ a remedy she knows of unless she may be his mistress; and he consents. (2) His next sin is to cast eyes of desire on the gentle and innocent Antonia, a maiden of Madrid. But Antonia is well guarded by her mother, and by Matilda's advice the Abbot asks aid of the Devil, who is summoned by gruesome rites in an underground cave (II, 259 ff.). Condemned to death by the Inquisition, the terrors of which are deployed at length (III, 271 f.), Ambrosio muses on God, immortality, and the forgiveness of sins; assents to these mysteries, but can only despair (III, 278, 279). Matilda,

[1] The relation of *Zastrozzi* to *The Monk* was pointed out by Mr A. B. Young in the *Modern Language Review*, vol. I, pp. 322 f.

entering the cell supernaturally, induces him to sign away his soul to the Devil; who then enters, whisks him to the brink of a precipice, and tumbles him into the abyss. The Devil at his appearance is accompanied by 'a strain of sweet but solemn music' (II, 197). Before securing Ambrosio's soul he is a beautiful youth (II, 273); after securing it he wears a form of terrible ugliness.

(3) In 1797 Mrs Radcliffe's *The Italian* added another figure to the Gothic gallery—the masterly plotter and murderer, Schedoni. A nobleman born, he enters a monastery after a youth of crime; and there, haughty, taciturn, austere, inspires his fellows with fear and curiosity. He had a lined face and piercing eyes; 'in his air as he stalked along wrapt in the black garments of his order there was something terrible, something almost superhuman.' A noble youth (Vivaldi) seeks in marriage a plebeian maiden (Ellena). His mother, the Marchesa di Vivaldi, determines to part them, and takes counsel of Schedoni, her confessor. Thereupon plot and counterplot; Schedoni (his action is hardly motived) standing at the Marchesa's side, spurring her even to murder, stilling her conscience, and executing her resolves.

The critical moment comes when, in the act to murder Ellena in her sleep, he is arrested by her beauty, sees his own portrait on her breast, and takes her for his own child. He too perishes in the Inquisition, the scenery of which is given in the author's lavish manner. (4) One more character is of moment to us—the ghost-like monk, who appears now and then to utter a warning voice, only to vanish with a super-human facility that eludes all pursuit.

Mrs Byrne wrote also under the names of 'Rosa Matilda' and 'Charlotte Dacre.' One of her romances is *The Nun of St Omer's*, and another in four volumes *The Passions*. In 1805 she published *Hours of Solitude*, two volumes of verse in the vein of Lewis. According to her portrait in this book she was a rather young lady, an impression which her writings do not disturb. In 1806 she published through Longman *Zofloya or The Moor*, described as 'a Romance of the fifteenth century, in three volumes, by Charlotte Dacre, better known as Rosa Matilda[1].' Medwin (I, 30, 31) after mentioning *The Italian* as a favourite work of Shelley's youth says that *Zofloya* 'quite enraptured' him and that it became the source for his two romances.

[1] There is no copy either in the British Museum, in the University Libraries of Cambridge or Edinburgh, or in the Advocates' Library, nor is it mentioned in the purview of the 'Auskunftsbureau der Deutschen Bibliotheken.' After reading in the British Museum a French translation in four volumes by a Madame de Viterne, Paris 1812, I found that the English original was in the Bodleian. As I was then at a distance from Oxford, Mrs Sidney Ball undertook with great kindness to verify my references.

The plot of *Zofloya* has affinities with both *The Monk* and *The Italian*. Victoria di Loredani, the heroine, is a Matilda amerced of demonic qualities. She is of a noble house in Venice; her father dies early; and her mother, who was a faithless wife, brings her up in a frivolous society. The girl was a beauty of the dark and imperious type; 'the wildest passions predominated in her bosom; to gratify them she possessed an unshrinking relentless soul that would not startle at the darkest crime' (I, x, 219). These passions impel her into crimes, in which, like the Marchesa di Vivaldi, she is assisted by a mysterious and commanding personality. But Zofloya the Moor differs, both apparently and essentially, from Schedoni; for Zofloya is the Devil himself manipulating the damnation of a soul, no longer acting through a subordinate, as in *The Monk*. The theme of a woman tempting a man is treated in two variations, and the contrast drawn by Lewis between an angelic and a brazen woman is sharpened by the matching of these types in love. The action falls into four parts:

(*a*) (5) Victoria engages the rich Count Berenza to make her his mistress and afterwards his wife. Berenza has already betrayed his affection for her when she boldly throws herself on his protection. He lodges her in his palace, but, wishing to prove her nature, treats her only as a sister or friend; and she draws him on by stratagems like those of Lewis's Matilda—by a melting melancholy, and by sighing forth an avowal of her passion in apparent sleep, while he is bending over her. As if still in sleep she starts forward to embrace him, opens her eyes, and exhibits a captivating shame (I, 228, 229). (6) After becoming Berenza's mistress she is with him on the Canal one evening when a woman (a cast-off favourite of his) darts murderous glances at her from a passing gondola. Soon after, an assassin attempts the Count's life as he is sleeping in his bed. Victoria intercepts the blow, incurring a slight wound, and so improves the occasion that Berenza marries her (I, xi).

(*b*) (7) Episode of Victoria's brother, Leonardo (I, xii f.). In the escaping assassin she recognised her own brother. He was a youth with amiable qualities, but weakly passionate and proud. His shame at his mother's infidelity to her husband drove him to disappear from Venice and his friends. In his wanderings he comes to the cottage of an old woman, just bereft of an only son who had tilled her garden and worked at it beyond his strength. Leonardo takes the son's place and tills the garden until the woman dies (II, xiii). (8) Returning to Venice, he becomes the favourite lover of Megalena Strozzi, Berenza's former mistress. One day Megalena finds him caressing another woman; she leads him home with the air of a fury; her dour silence reduces him to penitence, but he must purchase pardon by consenting to murder the new temptress (II, xiv, 42 f.). At Megalena's word he tries to assassinate Berenza; after which the guilty couple leave Venice in fear of detection.

(*c*) (9) Victoria falls in love with her brother-in-law, Henriquez, and is abetted by his Moorish servant, Zofloya. Henriquez is devoted to Lilla, a noble maiden with a seraphic face and a primitive innocence; but she is under a vow not to marry for a year, and they must wait out the time. She, her aged aunt, and Henriquez become members of Berenza's household. (10) Zofloya attracts Victoria by his majestic stature and extreme beauty, and haunts her dreams. She dreams that he asks her if she will belong to him at the moment when Henriquez is leading Lilla to the altar. 'Oh yes, yes!' she cries, whereupon Lilla becomes a spectre, and she herself takes the hand of Henriquez, only to see him turn to a skeleton (II, xvii, 113, 114). In the nights she feels that Zofloya is near her in the room; she sees his form and calls to it, but it vanishes. At length he seeks occasion to

speak, and offers to help her to win Henriquez and destroy her husband (II, xix). He gives her a slow poison which she administers to Berenza. (11) The household is moved to a chateau in the Apennines, on the skirts of a forest, where only the cataract or the bell and organ of a convent break the quietness (II, xxii, 199 f.). Victoria frequently meets her counsellor in the forest depths. He appears noiselessly and like a breath of wind; sometimes preceded by flute-like tones (II, xxiv, 239; cf. *The Monk*); he will stand suddenly before her when she has just left him far behind; once, in the flashes of a storm, she sees him like a spirit 'now emerging from among the trees, now scaling the pointed rock, and now appearing a figure of fire upon its lofty summit' (III, xviii, 74). He seems to come unbidden when she needs him most; and with him her spirit is at peace as without him it is racked with passion (II, xxiv). He pacifies her conscience by deriding right and wrong as scholastic inanities (II, xx, 171); checks her impatience at the slowness of the poison or any sign of mistrust by glances which she cannot meet; but allows her to try the drug on Lilla's aunt, who expires in convulsions at her feet (II, xxiii, 230 f.). (12) Berenza having died, she asks Zofloya to put Lilla also out of the way. For Henriquez does not conceal his repugnance to her brazen nature. When she caressed Lilla 'he almost trembled for her tender life and compared the picture in his mind to the snowy dove fondled by the ravenous vulture.' When Victoria avows her passion he sternly upbraids her, and declares that his devotion to Lilla is unalterable (III, xxvi). (13) Zofloya now carries off Lilla from the chateau, and confines her in an underground cave, bound to the wall with a chain; brings her food and drink daily, but without replying to her entreaties (III, xxvii, xxviii). (14) Maddened by her loss, Henriquez falls into a delirious fever, and is nursed by Victoria, who will not perceive the patient's loathing of her presence (III, xxviii, 51 f.). When she entreats his love and tells him Lilla is dead, he vows eternal fidelity to her memory, and swoons away. On recovery, finding his head on Victoria's breast, he starts aside as if from a serpent. Thereupon she seeks Zofloya in a terrible storm in the forest, and obtains a drug which will cause Henriquez to imagine she is Lilla and take her to his arms. The drug has its effect; a banquet is spread, music is played; in mad transport she dances with Henriquez until, tired with wine and pleasure, they retire to rest (III, xxviii, 71—87). On awaking and discovering the illusion he plunges a sword into his breast. (15) Victoria hurries to Lilla's prison, drags her forth by the hair, and, foiling her attempts to escape, stabs her body in innumerable places (III, xxix).

d. (16) Victoria gives her soul to the Moor. Zofloya now spirits his victim to an Alpine solitude, where they are taken by brigands to a cavern in the heart of a mountain. Robbers are seated there at their feast; the newcomers are welcomed. Zofloya accompanies the brigands in their expeditions and with him all their enterprizes prosper; they admire and fear him, for he is an enigma (III, xxx, xxxi). The Robber Chief and a woman living with him—she has a strange manner, and has lost her youth and beauty—behave to Victoria, the one with reserve, the other with hostility. They are discovered to be Leonardo and Megalena. The good-hearted Leonardo is contrasted with Victoria through the behaviour of each towards their mother, who is captured by the brigands and dies in the cavern. (17) The stronghold is betrayed to the military by a brigand named Ginotti; Leonardo and Megalena take their own lives. Victoria and Zofloya are surrounded by soldiers in the cavern, when it is shaken by an earthquake, and Zofloya escapes with her to the brink of a precipice. Since the death of Henriquez she has felt a tenderness for the Moor, and has frequently offered him her body and soul. And now, having caused her to repeat the assurance of self-surrender, he is changed before her eyes from beauty to hideousness; announcing in a terrific voice that he is Satan, he throws her from the steep, and her soul is received into hell (III, xxxiii).

(18) William Godwin's *St Leon* (1799) was a favourite book with Shelley (Medwin, I, 70), and he named it to Stockdale as a source of *St Irvyne* (Nov. 19, 1810). St Leon is a French nobleman, ruined

by extravagance and living with his family in a peasant's condition. An old man presents himself to him and says:—'The only thing I have to do in the world is to die. I seek a friend who will take care that I die in peace. Shall I trust you?' Before he can die he must impart a secret to one who will not disclose it, he must transfer to another certain powers of which he longs to be rid. The secret and the powers consist of the elixir of life, which he transfers to St Leon and dies (ch. xi—xiii). The elixir is made up of syrups and essences according to a prescription (ch. xxxiii).

Zastrozzi also presents us with the superman as criminal, as controlling an intrigue in which his employer is his dupe. Gothic writers found a thrilling virtue in the letter *z*, and by a syllable added to the Strozzi of *Zofloya* the hero has three to his name. He is a highwayman who, for a wrong done to his mother, pursues a relentless vengeance against the wrongdoer's son, Verezzi (the name occurs in *The Mysteries of Udolpho*). Matilda di Laurentini, a replica of Mrs Byrne's Victoria, is fiercely enamoured of Verezzi, who repulses her. As in *Zofloya*, the bold seductress is contrasted with the heavenly Countess Julia whom Verezzi loves. Zastrozzi becomes Matilda's accomplice and pretends to seek occasion to assassinate her rival; but he wishes only that Verezzi may yield to the temptress, forswear Julia, and lose his soul. The supernatural element is pared away; the hero, like Schedoni, is a disposer of events, but human. I will mark the phases of the action and the incidents clearly due to the adduced sources. The parenthetic numbers refer to the numbers given in parentheses above; the page citations to vol. I of Shelley's Prose Works, ed. Shepherd, 1897.

Ch. I: Verezzi confined by Zastrozzi in an underground cave (13). Ch. II: The cave shattered by lightning (17). Ch. III: Verezzi sheltered by the old woman whose garden he tills in place of her dead son (7). Ch. V: Matilda induces him to reside at her house; he cannot return her passion and contrasts her bold nature and commanding figure with his delicate Julia (12). She affects melancholy (5), and asks pardon for avowing her love. Ch. VI: She tells him that Julia is dead; he faints. Ch. VII: Wakes to find his head on Matilda's breast, and starts away as from a scorpion. Is nursed through a fever by Matilda, in spite of his manifest disgust and vows of fidelity to Julia (1, 12, 14). Ch. X: The chateau in the mountains (11, cf. p. 86, the bells and requiem from the convent, and the evening requiem in *The Italian*, ch. II). Ch. XII: Stratagem by which Verezzi is attacked by the disguised Zastrozzi and Matilda slightly wounded in

his defence (1, 6). She dreams Verezzi becomes a spectre as she gives him her hand at the altar (10). Ch. XIII: Verezzi overhears her lamenting his cruelty and clasps her to his breast, she pretending shame and surprise (1, 5). The bridal feast, music, and wild dance (14). All this time Matilda is impatient for the murder of Julia. Ch. IV: Zastrozzi rebukes her mistrust of him; proves his poisons on a hapless prisoner. Ch. IX: He argues with her conscience. Ch. XII: He constantly holds counsel with her in the forest by the chateau. His majestic appearance in a storm (11, 14). Ch. XIV: Verezzi being now forsworn, Zastrozzi inveigles the pair to Venice, where Matilda sees Julia in a passing gondola and eyes her like a basilisk (6). Ch. XV: Verezzi, overcome at seeing his lost love, hurried home by Matilda, who stirs his heart by reproachful silence (8). Julia enters the room, and in despair he stabs himself (14). Matilda murders Julia (15). Matilda's repentance and comforting vision in the prison of the Inquisition (2). Zastrozzi dies under torture, his vengeance fulfilled.

St Irvyne uses up the supernatural element from Mrs Byrne's book which was left out of *Zastrozzi*, and adds the motive of the *elixir vitae* from *St Leon*. The hero, Ginotti (17), has the gigantic stature and terrible eyes, the mysterious authority and reserve of Zofloya. As a young student he had denied God, devoted himself to the Devil, and discovered and tasted the elixir (ch. X, compare the twofold appearance of the devil first in beauty and then in ugliness, and the concomitant strain of music with 2, 11, 17). In the story he pursues a double end; as cursed with the elixir, he haunts a man to whom he will impart the secret, and so earn his own death; and as an infernal agent he corrupts an innocent girl.

(*a*) Wolfstein, whom he destines for the elixir, is a nobleman's son who has left home and joined a band of robbers in the Alps (the brigands' cavern, the feast, the sullen woman at the Chief's side, and Wolfstein's ascendancy over the brigands, all agreeing with 16). Ginotti, who is one of these robbers, aids Wolfstein to escape from their stronghold with the lovely captive Megalena (8). The lovers go to Genoa and lead a dissipated life. Episode of Olympia's passion for Wolfstein. Megalena discovers them together; and by her reproachful silence makes Wolfstein promise to murder her rival (8). Scene in Olympia's chamber; Wolfstein's arm arrested by her beauty (3). Ginotti frequently appears to Wolfstein in a ghostlike way (4, 11). He tells him that, having control of all his thoughts and actions (11), he is preparing him to receive a secret (ch. VIII). He makes him promise to

listen to this secret when the time for telling it comes and 'suffer his soul to rest in annihilation' (18). At the destined hour he gives him the prescription for the elixir (ch. x), and appoints him a meeting at the ruined Abbey by St Irvyne. There at dead of night Ginotti asks Wolfstein to deny God, which he refuses to do. The Devil appears, and they both fall dead as if blasted by fire. But Ginotti, though through the transference of the secret he dies in the flesh, must endure in hell the everlasting life he had sought by unlawful means. Shelley informed Stockdale (Nov. 14, 1810) that both the victims of this obscure scene perished by the elixir, and not by the blast of the Devil. It seems, then, that the effect of the drug depends on the recipient's belief in God. Wolfstein believes, and is saved from a lawless immortality; but we are not told what becomes of his soul.

(*b*) The tale of Eloise and her woes is inserted into the foregoing story (ch. vii, ix, xi, xii), but so that there is no apparent connection between the two trains of incident. At the beginning of the sub-plot in ch. vii, Eloise returns ruined and destitute to her home, St Irvyne's Castle, which she had left six years before. The story is to tell of her misfortunes. But in the sequel she is blissfully married and does not return home at all. She accompanies a dying mother from St Irvyne to Geneva, and meets a mysterious and fascinating stranger (Nempere) in a lonely house at which they are forced to lodge by the way (cf. *Mysteries of Udolpho*, vi, vii). After her mother's death Nempere first seduces Eloise, and then sells her to an English nobleman, who treats her with respect. At the nobleman's house she meets Fitzeustace, a beautiful soul, and falls in love with him. The crisis of the affair is brought about by his hearing her murmur a confession of her love in sleep (1, 5; and *The Italian*, ch. ii). The nobleman kills Nempere in a duel, and flees to England, whither the now married lovers follow him. In the last lines of the book we have this curt intimation:—'Nempere is Ginotti, Eloise is the sister of Wolfstein.' Now if Ginotti is Nempere, then he dies twice, once when the nobleman killed him, and afterwards from the elixir at St Irvyne's. Stockdale pointed this out, and Shelley answered (Nov. 19, 1810): 'You will perceive that Mountfort physically did kill Ginotti, which must appear from the latter's paleness'; which leaves us still wondering. The fact is, one form cannot contain the two natures in Ginotti. As a demon, presiding over souls and free of physical laws, he can die as often as Shelley chooses; as the man out of *St Leon*, only once. Shelley was trying to compound two series of marvels. But before reducing his book to rhyme and reason he wearied

of it, and sent the draft to Stockdale as it stood. Stockdale improved it a little[1], but the two strands of the story remain hanging asunder. It seems that Wolfstein is a replica of Leonardo in *Zofloya*. Wolfstein, we are told, left his home under circumstances which attached no guilt to himself but precluded his return (pp. 120, 133). This was also Leonardo's case, and both young men were sinful yet redeemable souls. As in *Zofloya* brother and sister meet at the end after many vicissitudes, so, it appears from the opening of chapter VII, the outcast Eloise was to have rejoined her brother at St Irvyne's, where they would have confronted Ginotti together and perished with him; they two perishing, however, with an assurance of salvation through faith and repentance. But then Fitzeustace intervened to take Eloise to England, and the tale fell to pieces. Perhaps Shelley became immersed all at once in the subject of free love, and changed the plot that he might the better expound his mind. I will give a reason presently for this conjecture.

So much of Shelley's incident is from Mrs Byrne that he does little but deal her cards afresh. In a few instances he paraphrases his models pretty closely, and these instances exhibit the difference between his style and theirs in fulness and portentous fervour. As thus:—*The Monk* (I, 156): 'Tremble, Ambrosio, the first step is taken, and he who breaks his faith with heaven will soon break it with man...Hark! 'twas the shriek of your better angel; he flees and leaves you for ever.' *St Irvyne* (ch. VII): 'But hush! what was that scream which was heard by the ear of listening enthusiasm? It was the shriek of the fair Eloise's better genius; it screamed to see the foe of the innocent girl so near—it is fled fast to Geneva. There, Eloise, will we meet again, methought it whispered, whilst a low hollow tone, hoarse from the dank vapours of the grave, seemed lowly to howl in the ear of rapt fancy, We meet again likewise.' In fact the only charm in the two novels is the author's sincere enjoyment of them. M. Koszul has noted Shelley's carelessness of mere narrative and his attention to dramatic incidents or to situations of horror or psychical stress. We may observe that he elaborates beyond his models the terrors of Verezzi's underground prison (*Zastr.* ch. I; the delirium and the crawling worms are his addition); the agony of a dangerous illness (*Zastr.* ch. VI); and especially the erotic tension and tumult between Verezzi and Matilda, in which, remarkably enough, there is more energy and detail than in Lewis or Mrs Byrne. He twice reproduces the incident of a mistress finding her

[1] 'I return the Romance...I am much obligated by the trouble you have taken to fit it for the press' (Letter to Stockdale, Nov. 14, 1810).

lover in dalliance with a rival and quelling him with silent reproach, and that again of a lover surprising his beloved in the avowal of her passion. The Alpine landscapes owed their features to the Gothic tradition, but his own mind was at work in the choice of those vivid marks of the mystery of life and death, familiar afterwards in his poetry —the sole scathed larch on the mountain-side or the thin grasses in the chinks of a castle wall[1]. Shelley's Alps, lurid as a coloured poster, are yet the first essays of a special sense for grandeur and energy, just as Zastrozzi and Ginotti are the infant brethren of Cenci.

In two letters to Godwin (Jan. 10 and March 8, 1812) Shelley says that he was 'in a state of intellectual sickness' when he wrote the novels, and that *Political Justice* suddenly and completely healed him. 'I was no longer the votary of romance; till then I had existed in an ideal world—now I found that in this universe of ours was enough to excite the interest of the heart, enough to employ the discussions of reason.' Is there external evidence for a sudden change from the romantic to the practical or speculative interest? I think, yes. *Zastrozzi* was 'in great part written by May of the year 1809' (Dowden I, 46). In the summer of 1810 Shelley left Eton; in December *St Irvyne* came out. A letter to Graham of April 1, 1810, proves that the romance was finished, or nearly so, by that date. Besides the novels *The Wandering Jew* is of a Gothic nature; in all probability Shelley composed it with Medwin at Christmas 1809–1810 (Dowden I, 44). In the *Original Poetry by Victor and Cazire* the Gothic pieces, besides the plagiarised *Eve of St Edmond*, are *Revenge* and *Ghasta*, and both are dated from those same Christmas weeks. The pieces dated from the ensuing summer are mostly of an elegiac kind and have no features of mystery or terror. There remains only *The Spectral Horseman* in the Margaret Nicholson poems, and that may have been composed at any time. There is a check to the romantic interest, therefore, after April 1810[2]. *St Irvyne* points the same way. Both the novels are full of the

[1] Cf., for instance, the moonlit scene in *Zastr.* ch. x with *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, ch. IV. The Alpine storm in the beginning of *St Irvyne* owes something to *Udolpho*, ch. L, and *St Leon*, ch. VII, where the lightning 'dancing on the top of the rocks' caught Shelley's fancy (p. 117); the figure of the 'long-protracted war echoing from cavern to cavern' (p. 115) remained in his mind to be splendidly rendered in *Prince Athanase*, 69—72. M. Koszul has noted the frequent appearance of the solitary pine (pp. 58, 121, 181), and compares *Queen Mab*, VII, 259, *Laon and Cythna*, VI, 10. For the grasses (p. 22) cf. *Udolpho* ch. XIX, *Rosalind and Helen* 823, *Julian and Maddalo* 224.

[2] The conversations with Hogg at Oxford are throughout of a speculative nature. But that romance was not banished from Shelley's mind we may argue from the fact that Medwin found him at College with a manuscript book of romances, and from Hogg's statement (ch. XXVIII) that after Eton Shelley 'had usually some tale on the anvil.' As to *Political Justice* Hogg somewhere suggests that Shelley read it at the house of

romancers' philosophic tags—discourses about morality, education, God, the future life. But free love, which is but briefly mentioned in *Zofloya* (ch. v) and only touched upon by a line in *Zastrozzi* (ch. xiii, p. 80), becomes in *St Irvyne* a theme for discussion (ch. ix, xii). May not the interest in this subject have come from *Political Justice* falling into Shelley's hands when he was half way through with his second romance? And may not the poor finishing of *St Irvyne* be due to the disturbance induced by the new influence? This leaning to speculation and science marks a period in Shelley's life, until imagination claimed its own again, feebly in *Queen Mab*, victoriously in *Alastor*.

A. M. D. Hughes.

Kiel.

Dr Lind; and Shelley told Godwin in January 1812, that he had first met with it more than two years before that date.

THE GENITIVE SUFFIX IN THE FIRST ELEMENT OF ENGLISH PLACE-NAMES.

The following investigation is based mainly on material which I have collected for a work on the Place-Names of Oxfordshire. The idea of an article of this nature and scope is due to a suggestion of Professor Wyld, who has also kindly furnished me with some supplementary material drawn from his book on *The Place-Names of Lancashire.* In ascertaining whether any principle is at work in the development of the genitive suffix in Place-Names, there are two main classes of names to be considered—those of the strong, and those of the weak, declension. Generally speaking it is normal for the names of the strong declension to retain their genitive suffix (*s*), though, as we shall see, there are numerous cases in which it is lost.

In the case of weak names, however, it would appear that, except under certain conditions, the *-an* of the genitive case normally disappears.

The material is arranged under five different heads—A. *Strong Personal Names,* which are divided into two classes:—(1) those which retain the genitive, and (2) those which lose it; B. *Weak Personal Names,* which fall into three classes:—(1) those which lose the genitive suffix; (2) those which retain it as *n* throughout their career; (3) those which change the genitive *-an* into *-in, -en* or *-ing.*

There is also a list of examples of the interchange of strong and weak suffixes in the same Place-Names.

A (1). *Strong names which retain the genitive suffix from earliest known form till present day.*

Modern Name	Conjectural O.E. Forms	Early Forms
Alvescot	*Ælfhēahes cott	*Elfegescote*, D. B. 160 b.
Ambrosden	*Amb(e)res or Eanbeorhtes denn	*Ambresdene*, D. B. 157 b.
Balscote	*Bælles cotan	1204 *Belescote*, Obl. Rlls 231.
Bloxham	*Bloces hām	1142–8 *Blocchesham*, Eynsh. Ch. I, 52.

Modern Name	Conjectural O.E. Forms	Early Forms
Chawsey	*Cealfes īeg	1274–9 *Chalmesleye* (for *Chalveseye*), Rot. Hund. II, 713.
Chilson	*Cildes tūn	1291 *Childestone*, Tax. Eccl. 45.
Cuddesdon	*Cūþwines dūn	956 ? *Cuþenes dūne*, Birch III, 123.
Cutslow	*Cūþes hlāwe	1004 *Cudeslawe*, C. D. III, 328.
Cuxham	*Cuces hamm	995 *Cuces hamme*, C. D. III, 289.
Dunsdon	*Dunes denn	1274–9 *Dunesdene*, Rot. Hund. II, 38.
Eynsham	*Ægenes hām	1163 *Egeneshā*, Pipe Rolls VI, 49.
Gangsdown	*Gangwulfes	1231 *Gangulvesden*, Cl. Rlls (1231–4) H. III, p. 13.
Grimsbury	*(æt) Grimes byrig	No forms.
Ipsden	*Ippes denn	1274–9 *Yppesden*, Rot. Hund. I, 42 etc.
Kelmscott	*Cynehelmes (Cylmes) cott	1274–9 *Kelmescote*, Rot. Hund. II, 695.
Kingsey	*Cyninges īeg	1267 *Kingeseye*, Cal. Ch. Rlls (1257–1300) II, 71.
Kingston	*Cyninges tūn	1274–9 *Kingeston*, Rot. Hund. II, 786.
Madmarston	*Mæþmæres tūn	No forms.
Sarsden	*Serces denn	1152–70 *Sercesd(ene)*, Eynsh. Ch. I, 112.
Shellswell	*Scealdes wiella	1299 *Shaldeswell*, Cal. Ch. Rlls II, 481 (1257–1300).
Spelsbury	*Spel(l)es byrig	1200– *Spellesbur'*, Testa de N. 102, 113.
Stonesfield	*Stuntes feld	1200– *Stuntesfeld*, Testa de N. 107.
Tetsworth	*Tettes wyrth	1200– *Tettesw'rth*, Testa de N. 120.
Tilgersley	*Tilgeardes lēah	1274–9 *Tilgardesle*, Rot. Hund. II, 859.
Tusmore	*Thōres mere	1200– *Thuresm'e*, Testa d. N. 101, 4.
Williamscot	*Wilhelmescott	1284–5 *Wilhamescote*, Feud. Aids IV, 156.
Woolaston	*Wīglāfes tūn	1267 *Wilavestona*, Cal. Ch. Rlls II, 69 (1257–1300).
Worsham	*Wulfmæres hām	1240† *Wolmersham*, Reg. Godst. Nunn. II, 551.
Wroxton	*Wrocces stān	1086 *Werochestan*, D. B. 159 b.

There is no need to add instances outside Oxfordshire to illustrate this retention of *s*. It is obvious that in the majority of cases the strong genitive *s* is retained. That this rule is not universal is shewn, however, by the following examples.

(2) *Cases where -s of strong genitive has been lost.*

Modern Name	Conjectural O.E. Forms	Early Forms
Alkerton	*Ælhheres tūn	1086 *Alcrintone*, D. B. 156. 1200 *Alkrinton*, Testa de N. 101. 1695 *Alkerington* Camden.

[In this name the loss of *-s* may be explained by the existence of two types, one containing the suffix *-ing*, the other containing the simple Personal Name *Ælhhere*, or else by a late metathesis and loss of *-ing*.]

Ardley	*Eardwulfes lēah	1086 *Ardulfeslie*, D. B. 157. 1200– *Ardulvele*, Testa de N. 101, 4. 1316 *Ardele*, Parl. Writs II, 353.

Modern Name	Conjectural O.E. Forms	Early Forms
Brighthampton	*Beorhthelmes tūn	1161 *Brihtelmeston*, Pipe Rlls IV, 9. 1274–9 *Brihtelminton* ⟩ Rot. Hund. II, *Brihtelme'ton* ⟨ 707. 1316 *Brighthelmeston*, Abbr. Plac. 324.
[Cf also *Brighton* (Sussex) which has the same etymology.]		
Rollright	*Hrōþlandes rīþ	1184 *Rollandrith*, Reg. Godst. Nunn. II, 532. 1307 *Rodlandrich* (*c* for *t*), Cal. Rot. Ch. 139. [No form in *-s* found.]
Tadmarton	*Thēodmǣres tūn or *Tatmǣres tūn	956 ? *Tadmœrtun*, C. D. II, 315 *Tademertūn*, II, 322. 1192 *Tadmarton*, Osn. Reg. 71. 1227–77 *Tademarton*, Non. Inq. 138.
[The etymology may, however, be *Tadan mere-tūn*—'the lake-town of *Tada*.']		
Wendlebury	*(æt) Wendeles byrig	1086 *Wandesberie*, D. B. 160. 1200– *Wendlebur'*, *Wendebur'*, Testa de N. 102, 117. 1274–9 *Wendlingbur'* ⟩ Rot. Hund. II, *Wendelbur'* ⟨ 45, 834.
Wolvercote	*(æt) Wulfgāres cotan	1086 *Ulfgarcote*, D. B. 159. 1149 *Wolgarcote*, Osn. Reg. 23. 1220 *Wolgoryscote*, *Walgarcote*, etc., Reg. Godst. Nunn. II, 574, 5. 1232 etc. *Wulgoricot*, etc., Cl. Rlls, Hy. III, 142 (1231–4).
[Out of 25 forms of this Place-Name which I have collected from various sources ranging from 1086 to 1695, only one (1220, above) has the genitive suffix in the first element.]		
Yelford	*Aegeles ford	1086 *Aieleforde*, D. B. 160. 1200– *Eleforde*, Testa de N. 102. 1245 *Eilesforde*, *Eillesford*, Cal. Ch. Rlls I, 285 (1226–57). 1535 *Elforde*, Val. Eccl. (Map).

To the foregoing examples may be added the following Lancashire names to illustrate the loss of *-s*.

Shuttleworth (*Suttelesworth* 1227).
Stainall (*Staynhole* 1200– no *s* forms).
Staynton (*Steynton* 1256).
Torboc (no *s* forms).
Thurstan Water (*Thurstaine* water 1196).
Turton (*Thurton* 1257– no *s* forms).
Winstanley (*Wynstanesligh* Lancashire Fines, I. 114).
Woolstenholme (*Wolftonesholme* 1290– form without *-s*—1332).

Cf. also **Liverpool** which Prof. Wyld has shown to be derived from *Lēofhere(s) pōl* and which has no form in *-s*, **Bartherton** (Cheshire) < *Beorhthere(s) tūn*, **Cholmundeley** (Cheshire) < *Ceolmunde(s) lēah* and many other names.

Causes of loss of -s.

It is thus obvious that a large number of Personal Names which are originally strong and take the genitive *-s* have lost this *-s* in the

modern name. Others show no sign of any *-s* suffix even in the oldest forms.

In the case of the latter class Professor Wyld has suggested that a usage without a genitive suffix may be due to the fact that the Personal Name was felt to be a sort of adjective qualifying the second element.

The cases where *-s*, once shewn, has disappeared in M.E. may be accounted for in different ways. We may note, in passing, that this disappearance is usually complete, i.e., no forms in *-s* are found by the first half of the thirteenth century.

(*a*) The *-s* tends to disappear when a syllable which contains it is lost. This is the case in Rollright, Ardley (above) and probably in Lancashire Aintree (*Ægenwulfes trēow*). Cf. also Brighton (Sussex) < *Beorhtelmestūn.*

(*b*) There may be two types; one with the Personal Name, the other with the suffix *-ing*, and contamination may take place. Besides Alkerton (above) this may have influenced the development of Brighthampton (cf. Brihthelminton), Wendlebury (cf. Wendlingbur').

(*c*) Analogy with other Place-Names may have an influence in causing the loss of *s*. Brighthampton is obviously influenced by the analogy of Place-Names compounded with O.E. *hām* or *ham*(*m*), e.g., Hampton (O.E. *hăm*(*m*)*-tūn*), Chislehampton (O.E. *ceōsel* + *ham*(*m*) + *tūn*), Hampden (O.E. *hăm*(*m*) + *denn*), etc. Tadmarton (above) may have been influenced by Marton (O.E. *mere-tūn*), if the etymology *is* not actually *Tadan mere-tūn*, as suggested above.

(*d*) Finally it is possible that a large number of Place-Names, in which the first element originally was strong, have replaced the strong genitive by a weak suffix *-an*, which was normally lost, as will be seen later. To show the possibility of such an occurrence I have collected together cases of the interchange of strong and weak suffixes in early forms of the same name; in some of these examples the replacement has been permanent (see below, p. 71).

B. *The weak genitive in -an; its three-fold development.*

The cases investigated point to three possibilities in the development of the weak genitive suffix *-an*:—(1) it may be lost altogether; (2) it may be retained as *n*; (3) it may develop into *-en*, *-in* or *-ing*.

(1) Except before vowels and sometimes before *dūn* and *tūn* the weak genitive tends to disappear altogether.

The examples are the following:

Modern Name	Conjectural O.E. Forms	Early Forms
Bablock Hythe	*Babban lacu+hȳþ	1274–9 *Babbelak*, Rot. Hund. II, 733.
Baldon	*Bealdan dun	1274–9 *Baldendon*, Rot. Hund. II, 818. 1369 etc. *Baldyngdon*, St Frid's Ch. I, 236.
[Two types; (1) Baldendon, (2) Baldenton > (1) Baldedon > Baldon. (2) Baldington (1535). The type without *-ing* has survived.]		
Banbury	*(æt) Banan byrig	1239 *Bannebiry*, Eynsh. Ch. I, 4.
Beckley **Begbroke**	*Beccan lēah / brōc	1149 *Bekeley*, Osn. Reg. 22. 1086 *Bechebroc*, D. B. 161.
Bicester	*Beornan ceaster	1086 *Bernecestre*, D. B. 158. 1200– *Burnecestre*, etc. Testa de N. 107.
Binfield	*Bynnan feld	1272–1377 *Benefeld*, Quo Warr. 669.
Cadwell	*Cadan wiella	1205 *Cadewell*, Obl. Rlls 335.
Chilworth	*Ceolan wyrth	1200– *Chelew'rth*, Testa de N. 100.
Copcourt	*Cuban cott	1316 *Copecote*, 1428 *Cobbecotes* } Feud. Aids, IV, 171, 192.
Cowley	*Cufan lēah	1199 *Cuveleia*, St Frid's Ch. I, 43.
Culham	*Culan hăm(m)	940 ? *Culan ham*, Birch II, 486. *Culen hēma*, *Culeham* } C. D. V, 264. 1200– *Culham*, Testa de N. 1274–9 *Colnham*, Rot. Hund. II, 852. 1482–91 *Culneham*, Mins. Accs. 336.
[Two types; one preserves *n* before second element beginning with aspirate (see under (2)); the other loses *n* early. The type without *n* has survived.]		
***Epwell**	*Eoppan wiella	956 *Eoppan wyllan*, C. D. III, 438. 1200– *Eppewelle*, Testa de N. 120.
Hanborough **Hanwell**	*Hana byrig / wiella	1200– *Hanaber'*, Testa de N. 118. 1200– *Hanewell*, Testa de N. 113. *Hanywell*, Feud. Aids IV, 179.
Horley	*Hornan lēah	1200– *Hornele*, Testa de N. 103.
Idbury	*(æt) Idan byrig	1260 *Ydebury*, St Frid's Ch. II, 275.
Kidmore End	*Cyddan mōr	No forms.
Ledwell	*Lēodan wiella	*Ledewelle*, *Ludewelle* } D. B. 156 a.
Otmoor	*Otan mōr	No forms—but contiguous to **Oddington** which < *Otan dūn*.
Rofford	*Roppan ford	1086 *Ropeford*, D. B. 1606.
Sewell	*Syfan wiella	1086 *Sevewelle*, *Sivewelle* } D. B. 156 b, 157.
Shutford	*Scyttan ford	1254 *Shutteford*, Cal. Rol. Ch. 81 (fol.). 1390 *Shiteford*, Cal. I. P. M. III, 113.
Sibford	*Sibban ford	1200– *Sibeford*, *Sibbeford*, Testa de N. 100 etc.
Tackley	*Tæccan, *Tacan lēah	1086 *Tachelie*, D. B. 157. 1176 *Tuccheleia*, Eynsh. Ch. I, 97.
Thomley	*Tuman lēah	1086 *Tumbeleia*, D. B. 156 a. 1124–30 *Thumeleya*, St Frid's Ch. I, 14.
Wretchwick	*Wræccan wīc	1182 *Wrechewich*, 1299 *Wrecchewyk* } Index, p. 845.

These form the great majority of the cases where a weak Personal Name is the first element. In a few cases where the *-en* is retained it is probably due to the adjectival form *-en*, e.g., Brackenborough (Lincolnshire), etc.

The second class consists of Place-Names in which the *n* is retained before a second element which begins with a vowel or an aspirate, e.g., O.E. *ēā, īēg, ōfer, hofer, hyll, hȳþ*, etc.

(2) *Weak names which retain genitive -n as n.*

Modern Name	Conjectural O.E. Forms	Early Forms
Bolney	Bulan hȳþ	1227–77 *Bolehuthe*, Non. Inq. p. 136. 1428 *Bulnehith*, Feud. Aids iv, 200. 1466 *Bulnythe*, Cat. A. D. ii, 514.
Bucknell	*Buccan hyll	1086 *Buchehelle*, D. B. 158. 1200– *Buckehull*, *Bikehell*, Testa de N. 101, 112. 1149 *Buckenhull*, Osn. Reg. 22. 1535 *Buknel*, Val. Eccl. (Map).
Chimney	*Ceomman īēg	985 ? *Ceommenige*, C. D. iv, 275. 1274–9 *Chemeneye*, Rot. Hund. ii, 705.
Osney	*Osan īēg	999–1006 *Osanig*, Thorpe 550. 1191–1205 *Oseneye*, Eynsh. Ch. i, 40.
Lewknor	*Lēofecan ōfer	1178 etc. *Levekenore*, Eynsh. Ch. i, 47 etc.
Witney	*Wit(t)an īēg	1044 *Wittanige*, C. D. iv, 92. 1200– *Wyteney*, Testa de N. 104.
Sydenham (Sidnəm)	Sidan hām	1200– *Sidenham*, *Sideham*, Testa de N. 100, 7.

[This may, however, <æt sīdan ham(m)—'at the wide enclosure.']

In these names the *n* of the genitive case combines with the second element to form the last syllable of the word.

Sometimes in the case of *hăm(m)* there are two types—with and without *n*. If the aspirate is retained the *n* probably disappears, if it is lost the *n* remains before the vowel. The type without *n* sometimes survives. Examples are Culham (above), Clapham (O.E. *Clappan* or *Cloppan hām*), Swaffham (O.E. **Swæfan hām*—Skeat, *Place-Names Cambridgeshire*, p. 23), Pelham (O.E. *Peolan hām—Place-Names Hertfordshire*, p. 31), Waltham (O.E. **Wealtan hām—ibid.* p. 33), Bilham (O. E. *Billan hām*—Moorman, *West-Riding Place-Names*, p. 261).

(3) The third class of weak names consists of those in which the genitive suffix is retained either as *-en, -in* or *-ing*. It will be noticed that in all these names the genitive is followed by *-tūn* or *-dun*.

Weak names which change -an to -en, -in, -ing.

(*a*) *-an > -en > -ing.*

Modern Name	Conjectural O.E. Forms	Early Forms
Attington	*Attan dūn	1274–9 *Attendon*, Rot. Hund. II, 821.
Bullingdon	*Bulan denn	1274–9 *Bulenden* } Rot. Hund. II, 38, *Bolendon* } 713. *Bulendon*, II, 718. *Bulingdene*, *Bullingdene*, etc. II, 30, 46.
Easington	*Æscan } dūn Esan }	1086 *Esidone*, D. B. 160. 1150† *Esendone*, Reg. Godst. Nunn. 322. 1274–9 *Esindon*, Rot. Hund. II, 756.
Goddington	*Godan dūn	1086 *Godendone*, D. B. 159 a. 1391 *Goddyngdon*, *Goddington*, Cal. A. D. I, 396.
Oddington	*Otan dūn	1086 *Otendone*, D. B. 160 b. 1200– *Otindon*, etc. Testa de N. 101. 1274–9 *Otendun*, etc. Rot. Hund. I, 45.
Tiddington	*Tyttan dūn	1086 *Titedone*, D. B. 160 b. 1200– *Tetindon*, Testa de N. 105.
Wiggin(g)ton	*Wigan } tūn Wycgan }	1086 *Wigentone*, D. B. 160. 1200– *Wigentone*, *Winginton*! Testa de N. 101, 4.

Chippinghurst (O.E. *Cybban hyrst*) would, at first sight, appear to be a case of a similar development, but the change is probably due to popular etymology, the first element being confused with Chipping < O.E. *cēapian* (to bargain, market), as in Chipping Norton.

(*b*) *-an > -en.*

Modern Name	Conjectural O.E. Forms	Early Forms
Assendon	Asan tūn	1614 *Assenton*, Index 26. 1695 *Assington*, Map in Camden's *Britannia*.
The *-en* type has survived.		
Checkendon	Cæccan denn	1086 *Cecadene*, *Secendene*, *Secedene*, D. B. 159 a, 160. 1200 *Chakenden*, *Chakeden*, etc. Testa de N. 102, 6.

It appears from the foregoing that the tendency is for the weak genitive suffix to disappear except under the conditions stated. The cause of its retention before an aspirate or a vowel is obvious—it coalesces with the second element to form a syllable and its loss would cause a hiatus.

In the other cases the suffix is retained before *-dūn* and *-tūn* usually as *-ing* (very rarely *-en*). This tendency may possibly be due to the fact that the initial consonant of these elements is a point

consonant and therefore similar to *n* (point-nasal). O.E. *-trēow* as in Coventry (< *Cofan treow*) is another second element before which the *-n* seems to be kept.

It can hardly be entirely due to chance that we find, speaking generally, that the *-n* tends to disappear before every other element except these three: there may therefore be a phonetic cause at the basis of the differentiation.

It cannot be said, however, that any of these principles apply universally. In addition to the cases of *n* being lost before *-hām* which are mentioned above, there are cases of the weak suffix being lost before *-tūn*, e.g. Potton (O.E. *Pottan tūn*—Skeat, *Place-Names Bedfordshire*, p. 54), Watton (O.E. *Wadan tūn*—*Place-Names Hertfordshire*, p. 49), Harlton (O.E. **Herlan tūn*—*Place-Names Cambridgeshire*, p. 10), Ripton (O.E. *Rippan tūn*—*Place-Names Huntingdonshire*, p. 345), Brampton (O.E. *Brandan tūn*—*ibid.* p. 342).

In some of these cases, however, the *-n* is preceded as well as followed by a point consonant and this might be sufficient to cause its disappearance.

In *-den* we have such names as Cobden (< *Cobban denn*—*Place-Names Hertfordshire*, p. 23), and Munden (*Mundan denn*—*ibid.* p. 22). The latter, however, normally loses the *n*.

In order to illustrate one of the causes which has been suggested to explain the loss of the strong genitive suffix (see above, p. 67), I append a list of examples of interchange between the strong and weak suffixes.

(1) *Substitution of strong genitive for weak genitive.*

(*a*) *Permanently.*

Modern Name	Conjectural O.E. Forms	Early Forms
Harpsden	*Hearpan denn	1086 *Harpendene*, D. B. 159. 1200– *Harpesden*, Harpeden, Testa de N. 111, 117. 1274–9 *Harpesden*, Rot. Hund. I, 33.

(*b*) *Sporadically.*

Banbury	*(æt) Banan byrig	1086 *Banesberie*, D. B. 155. 1239 *Bannebiry*, Eynsh. Ch. I, 1.
Chilworth	*Ceolan wyrth	1200– etc. *Chelew'rth*, Testa de N. 100. 1274–9 *Chulleworth*, *Cheleworth*, *Chelesworth*, *Chellesworth*, Rot. Hund. II, 714, 5, 6. 1316 *Cheleworthe*, Parl. Writs, II, 353.
Rofford	*Roppan ford	1086 *Ropeford*, D. B. 160 b. 1205 *Roppesford*, Obl. Rlls, I, 334. 1316 *Ropford*, Parl. Writs, II, 354 etc.
Sibford	*Sibban ford	1200– *Sibeford*, *Sibesford*, *Sibbeford*, Testa de N. 100, 4.

(2) *Substitution of strong genitive -s for feminine genitive.*

Modern Name	Conjectural O.E. Forms	Early Forms
Fritwell	*Friþa wiella ?	1154 *Fertewelle*, Eynsh. Ch. I, 39. 1199 etc. *Fretewelle*, I, 132. 1260 *Fretheswelle*, I, 400. 1231–2 *Fritwell*, St Frid's Ch. II, 40.

[The first element is perhaps however not originally a Personal Name, but the addition of *s* would show that it was later regarded as one.]

Cf. in *Lancs.*

***Gunnels Fold**	*Gunhilde ford	1250 *Gunnildes ford.*

(3) *Substitution of weak for strong genitive.*

(*a*) *Permanently.*

Bletchingdon	*Blæcces	{tūn dūn	1086 *Blecestone*, *Blicestone*, D. B. 154, 160 b. 1139+ *Blachedon*, *Blechedon*, Reg. Godst. Nunn. 214. 1200– *Blecchesdon*, Testa de N. 112. 1274–9 *Blehcchesdone*, Rot. Hund. II, 830. 1279 *Blechindon*, Abbr. Plac. 197.

(*b*) *Sporadically.*

Cutslow	*Cūþes hlāwe	995 ? *Cudeshlāwe*, *Cudanhlæwe*, C. D. III, 289.
Sarsden	*Serces (*Sǣrices) denn	1152–70 *Sercesd(ene)* } Eynsh. Ch. I, 1180 *Cercendene* } 112. 1181–97 *Cherchesdena*, *ibid.* I, 122.
Woolaston	*Wīglāfes tūn	1200– *Willavinton*, Testa de N. 127. 1267 *Wilavestone*, Cal. Ch. Rlls, II, 69.

[Perhaps *-in* < *-ing*, see above. Cp. also *Brihthelminton*, above.]

Toot Baldon	Thēodbaldes tūn ?	1274 *Todbaldiston*, Abbr. Plac. 192. 1312 *Totbaldyndone*, Index, p. 36.

[But if this Place-Name < *tōt* (a hill) + *Baldon* which < *Bealdan dūn* the form in *Abbr. Plac.* is an instance of the converse process.]

All the preceding cases prove that confusion frequently arose in M.E. between the strong and weak genitival endings, and we see that sometimes the strong form survived sometimes the weak. This survival is not determined by any phonetic considerations but is merely a matter of chance.

So far as can be judged from the evidence here examined, the genitive suffix shows the following tendencies in its development. (1) The strong genitive in *-s* normally persists in Place-Names; sometimes, however, when the Personal Name consists of more than one syllable it is lost, and the process which the name undergoes in many cases is probably first a substitution of a weak for a strong genitive, and secondly the normal loss of the weak genitive. Such

names have usually lost their genitive *-s* by the thirteenth century—often much earlier.

(2) The weak genitive is normally lost in Place-Names except when it occurs before a second element which has an initial aspirate (which is dropped), vowel, or point consonant. In the first and second cases it remains as *n*; in the latter case it usually develops into *-ing* before the ending *-tūn* (*-ton*), and into *-en* or *-ing* before *-dūn*, *-den(n)* and *-trēow*.

Finally, interchange between strong and weak genitival endings is frequent in the M.E. forms of Place-Names and in some cases this interchange is permanent.

In conclusion it must be stated that these are only tendencies which manifest themselves in the development of the genitive case and that they do not possess the rigidity of phonetic laws.

HENRY ALEXANDER.

OXFORD.

AN ANGLO-FRENCH LIFE OF SAINT OSITH[1].

Language and Versification.

As few Anglo-Norman texts are accessible in good editions, it seems fitting to follow the method as far as possible of one of the best of these—Professor Stimming's *Boeve de Haumtone*—and to present this study of the language of the Life of St Osith in the same order; we can then refer to the pages in his edition where references are made to other texts and thus economise space. We shall refer to his edition as St. and to Suchier's *Voyelles toniques* as S. The comparison is made all through with Central French. The two portions of the poem which, as we have stated in the Introduction, appear to be of doubtful originality, will be referred to as (A) and (B) when they call for special notice.

Vowels.

§ 1. French *a*.

This sound appears regularly as *a* in conformity with Central French as is proved by the rimes in *a*, e.g. 33, 165, 173, 467 etc., also in (B) 221, 227, 348. Neither the scribe nor the author knew the form in *ai* (cf. *Vie de saint Richard*[2]). Other pure rimes in *-a* are: *-able* 17; *-acle* 365; *-age* 71, 375; *-as* 371, 653; *-ast* 119, 563.

Before *l*, the development of Latin *-a* tonic shows hesitation; thus side by side with the correct *tel* : *ostel* 1123 (cf. § 4) we find *esperital* 308 (cf. § 59) but only in (B); the remaining rimes in *-al* [all in (B)] are correct—305, 307.

This hesitation of the ending < *-alis* is found often in Anglo-Norman and Norman, commonly in the West of France, while it is correct in S. W. French dialects. For Agn. Gaimar has *ostel* : *criminel* 545; *mal* : *estal* 3129. Adgar rimes *mal* : *reial* xvii 545; *vassals* : *reials*

[1] Continued from *Modern Language Review*, Vol. VI, No. 4.

[2] *Vie de saint Richard* in *Revue des Langues romanes*, Oct. 1910. We shall refer to this life again simply as *St Richard*.

xxxiv 93; *mals* : *criminals* xxviii 105 etc. In our poem both poet and scribe knew only the forms *tel* and *quel*. Before *r* here as elsewhere in Agn. we find sometimes *e*, e.g. *herneschant* 913.

In the protonic syllable *a* remains, at least in the orthography; nothing further can be said as there are no cases of rich or over rich rime. Thus we find *laur* 895; *flael* 1428 etc.; and after a palatal *chaere* 1639, 1649, and the learned *chanoine* 1263 etc., *charité* 1468.

Here as elsewhere in Agn. we have *chescun*.

The protonic syllable has disappeared in *granter* 1093, though it would seem to be required in the original text in line 723.

Protonic initial *a* is sometimes replaced by a different prefix *en* as *entendirent* for *atendirent* 803; *enchesoun* 304 for *achoison* or *achoise*, *ensemblé* 428. [St., pp. 172—3.]

§ 2. French *ã*.

The Agn. custom of writing *-an* as *-aun* is rare in our poem; we find only *auntes* 206 (B); the rimes in *-ant* are all pure, cf. 61, 185, 473, 535, 541 etc. and 317—9 in (B), also those in *-ance* 157 and in *-andre* 41; *orient* and *talent* which hesitate in Agn. and Norman are here found only in rime with *-en*, cf. § 6. Here, as commonly in Agn., we have *uncore*, a form which may be due to analogy with *unc*, *onc* < unquam. In the protonic, the scribe at any rate uses *en*, e.g. *ensenglanté* 817, 823. [St., p. 173; S. § 39.]

§ 3. French open *e* [ɛ].

After *e* and before *u* < *l* a glide *a* has developed; thus *beau passim*; this sound may then rime with *-aus* < *al* + *s*, cf. *beaus* : *chivaus* 25 (cf. S. §§ 58 a, 59 b). The rimes in *-e* are mainly pure, cf. *chancel* : *bel* 1203; *mantel* : *pasturel* 331 (B); *novele* : *ancele* 433 (cf. S. § 15 b): *apele* 635; *anceles* : *puceles* 49; *pucele* : *bele* 169; *apres* : *confes* 965 : *ades*; *pert* : *sert* 5; *apert* : *cert* 189 : *offert* 1615; *tempeste* : *moleste* 865; those in *-ere* are furnished only by *terre*, *guerre*, and *quere* or their derivatives, cf. 83, 380, 1075, 1085, 1163, 1565.

There is some hesitation with *est*, it rimes correctly with *prest* 571 but also with *icest* 543, 729; a similar rime may be found in the *Tristan* of Béroul 2049 and in the *Bestiaire* of Philippe de Thaon 881 *est* : *met* < mittit, and with this may be compared the rime *ere* (< erat) : *pere* in *Sainte Marie l'Égyptienne* 511[1] and *Énéas* 2159, 3927.

The words *mariners* : *juvenels* 883 have been corrected in a footnote to the text. [St., p. 174.]

[1] Our edition of this interesting life is to appear shortly.

§ 4. French close *e* [e].

Central Old French possessed two varieties of close *e* which may have differed by length only:

A. Close short *e* < Latin checked *ē* and *ĭ* except before nasal consonant. There is no satisfactory rime on this sound; *richesse* : *tristesse* 15 proves nothing as both represent *-itia*[1] but the former should give *richise*; the other *-chiiet* : *met* 601 is hardly satisfactory; here *chiiet* of the MS. or perhaps *chuet*, since the right to left strokes which are usually found over *i* are here absent, would seem to be for *calet*, the word does not appear elsewhere in the poem but it is found in Agn. as *cheut* and *chiut* (Central French *chieut*) in the *Quatre Livres des Rois* and in Samson de Nantuil who rimes *chiut* : *suit* (cf. Suchier § 32 a). If *chuet* is the correct reading of the MS., it seems likely that it is an alteration of the scribe for *cheut*; this change of spelling should indicate a pronunciation *ö* which varied between *œ* and *ɸ* according to the consonant which followed; the presence of the labial nasal in *met* may have produced an effect of rounding (the *ę̆* is very rare in rime[2]) and have caused the poet to consider the rime good enough. Another solution seems possible and this is that the poet wrote the form *chiet*; *ie* standing for *ieu*, a reduction to be found in several Norman and Agn. poets, cf. *fieu* > *fié*, e.g. *fiez* : *veziëz*, Marie de France, *Eliduc* 63; this would then give a rime *ié* : *ę̆*; similar rimes are found e.g. *clers* (< clĕricos) : *fers* (< fĕros) *St Gilles* 2241; *clerz* : *querz* in Frère Angier, *Grégoire* 3 r°a.

B. *e* long < Latin *a*.

The instances are extremely common and words with this accented vowel form a large percentage of the rime words. The rimes are pure, viz.:

é 21, 93, 95, 129, 143 etc., also in (B) 205, 327 etc.
ée 69, 127, 171.
ef *nef* : *tref* 945, also (B) 276.
el *tel* : *ostel* 1123, cf. § 1.

[1] What should be the outcome of *-itia* is a much discussed difficulty; we have *richise* (*Poème moral*); *richeise* (Adgar xxx 29); *St Gilles* has *richeise* and *richaise* and *richesce* 356, 277, 549 but only *richeise* (: *peise*) in rime; *Bestiaire* has *justise* : *mise* 67 and *richeise* : *depreise* 1409. We may suppose *richesce* to be a younger form.

[2] For the scarcity of this rime cf. S. § 16 e and Förster in *Zeitschrift* xxviii, 508; the tirades of any assonanced *chanson de geste* will if long be found on examination to consist largely of diminutives as final words; in rimed poems, *ę̆* hardly furnished 1 per cent. of the rimes, thus *met* occurs in rime only three times in Wace, cf. Pohl in *Rom. Forsch.* ii, p. 544; twice in Benoit, cf. Stock in *Rom. Stud.* iii, 450; twice in *Énéas* 3721, 8981 (*metent* : *getent* 3833); once in Adgar 29. 46; once in *Ste Marie* 1083, and not at all in *St Gilles* or the *Adamspiel*, while in the Bestiaire we find *met* : *bec*, the vowel of which is probably open, cf. § 3.

er infinitives of the 1st conjugation are very numerous, cf. § 17 (for *targer* : *saver* 304 cf. § 15).

ere rime furnished only by *pere* : *mere* 23, 133.

ez 2nd person pl. of verbs and a few other words as *delez* : *prez* 323 and the endings *-atus, -atos.*

Different spellings are used to denote this sound, viz.:

(i) *e* as above and also in *el* < alum for aliud 1301, *heent* 796, *sevent* 185, *set* 96, 544.

(ii) *ee* as *neez* 32, cf. also *vv.* 369—70.

(iii) *ei* as *asenseie* (: *veie*, cf. § 15) 1181.

(iv) *i* as in the form *remis* for *remes* < remansum; this past participle is found in certain Agn. and Norman works, cf. Suchier § 17 d. [St., pp. 175—6.]

§ 5. French atonic *e.*

A. Before the accented syllable.

Side by side with the correct and usual form *e* as in *chevache* 601, *chemin* 273, *cheminal* 307, *acheminé* 270, *enchesoun* 304, *poseer* 1453, *repelle* 378 etc. we have other spellings:

(i) *a* *asaer* 937, *manascer* 703.

(ii) *i* *chival* 26, 600, 605; *cristiene* 795; *diable* 1313; *ordinez* 417, 1251; *primere* 157.

(iii) *o* (*u*) *sucur* 125; *solunc* 1599; *pour* 630; *suveus* 344; *sovaus* 1578; *pousté* 1666.

(iv) In the 3rd pl. pres. indic. *-ent* appears frequently as *-unt*, e.g. *atendunt* 28 etc.

Very early (certainly since the fourth decade of the twelfth century) Agn. words are found in which atonic *e* is either omitted or not counted in scansion. The earliest to show this reduction seem to be nouns in *-ure* as the *porture* 380, *enveisure* 992 of our text and a compound like *bonurté* and perhaps *bonuré* 127; next in order come past participles in *-ëu* as *jëu, vëu*, cf. 1153, and *granté*, cf. 1214, then the corresponding preterites as our *decut* 1400, *jut* (: *apercut*) 1139; about the same time is to be placed the mutation of the feminine *e* of adverbs: *drein* 871; *memes* 246, 1570 (but cf. 1576); *seurement* (cf. 88), *veraiement.*

B. After the accented syllable.

It is a sign of late thirteenth century Anglo-Norman to find the final *e* wanting; except for *un'* 869 and *el'* 1573, this occurs only in (B) *disai* 201, *merveil* 266 (: *conseil*), *chai* (: *obli*) 281, but cf. § 55 II, *chausé* 335.

It is doubtful whether the rime *verité* : *voé* 527 is a case of disappearance of final *e*; although only *voée* seems to be known in the sense of *vow*, it is possible that a masculine form may also have existed; it should be noticed that the adjective is in the masculine. In the *Haveloc* we find *avowé* as a masculine (: *adubbé*) 927.

We may now enquire into the syllabic value of this *e* and we shall consider (B) apart.

I. In the following cases *e* appears in the orthography and is syllabic.

(*a*) Nouns: *deable* 1309, 1313; *ordenez* 660; *reïne* 134, 688; *seüs* 562; in line 697 the initial word *mes* should be omitted.

(*β*) Pronoun: *ele* 1388.

(*γ*) Verbs: (i) past participles: *creu* 1332; *leue* 67; *seu* 68, 1042; *peu* 115; *veu* 444, 561, 927, 1064, 1306, 1402 and 309 (B).

(ii) other parts of the verb: *deusent* 1453; *deseelez* 1409; *poseer* 1453; *veum* 21; *veeit* 168; *veeir* 348 (B).

(*δ*) Adjectives and adverbs: *derein* 1097; *verai* 59; *nomeement* 1300, 1605.

(*ε*) The *e* is also counted after a vowel with following consonant: *contrée* 186; *guarrie* 1284; *portée* 1217; *venue* 1212; *voie* 1170.

(*ζ*) The word *sire* which in Agn. often counts for one syllable only (cf. St Richard § 77) is here dissyllabic, e.g. 1142, 1161, 1587.

II. In the following cases *e* appears but is not counted.

(*a*) Nouns: *deable* 696, 1303 (cf. I(*a*) above); *havene* 877 etc.; in *abeïes* 784 the line appears to have been altered by the scribe who has inserted *la* unnecessarily.

(*β*) Pronouns: *une* 536; *ele* 1246, 1301, 1388, 1572; *cele* 1177, 1231 etc.

(*γ*) Verbs: *purveu* 1153, especially with the combination mute + liquid: *enbeverez* 493; *troverez* 1173; *severez* 1364; *deliverat* 1408; *avera passim*; since *teoldé* 874 is not found elsewhere, it is difficult to decide, but as *tialz* (see footnote to l. 874) is dissyllabic the verb should be also, the line could be emended by omission of *bien*.

(*δ*) Adjectives and adverbs: *veraie* 1286; *vereiement* 1597; *seurement* 88; *meimes* 493, 575; *cume* 1398.

(*ε*) Preposition: *dekes* = *dek'* 1018 and elsewhere.

An *e* may be inserted contrary to etymology and will then not be counted, e.g. *creient* 5; *empouerïst* 692; *perdeu* 169, 1676; *seurveillie* 1104.

In the section we call (B) the accented vowel is generally silent

in any position, thus: *age* 264 for *eage*; *ewe* 273; *sust* 253; *seumes* 338; *peust* 360; *deust* 359; *preist* 228; *veistes* 329; *veimes* 334; *venir* 261; *appela* 241; *amedouz* (fem.) 341 influenced by *ansdous*; *une* 290. [St., pp. 176—84.]

§ 6. French *ẽ*.

The nasal is invariably represented by *en* and the rimes are all pure, there is no confusion of *en* and *an* (cf. § 2). Rimes in *-ent* (41 in all) are pure as e.g. *prent* : *follement* 9; *entent* : *sovent* 101 etc.; even *talent* and *orient* rime with *vent* 906, *premerement* 1341 and with *rent* 837: the same is true for (B). The purity of the rimes is carried through even before a heavy consonant group, e.g. *prendre* : *atendre* 657; *entre* : *ventre* 611.

As in Central French we have *volentiers* 119, 250. The change of the suffix *a* to *en* as in *enchesoun* 304 (compared with the correct form *achesun* l. 1508), common in thirteenth century Agn., is attributable to the scribe. Cf. § 1. [St., pp. 184—5.]

§ 7. French *i*.

This vowel appears regularly as *i* : *belif* 947; *dis* 1653 etc.; the spelling *y*, frequent in the latter part of the thirteenth century (cf. Stürzinger, *Orthographia gallica*, rule 17), is little used in our poem; we find however *ly* 549; *say* 1162 (but *sai* 1164); *noyse* 536; *ymage* 1492; *Ynguar* 770.

The rimes in *-i* are pure, consisting chiefly of past participles of the second conjugation, e.g. ll. 57, 149, or of *ci*, *si*, *merci* etc., e.g. 187, 351, 353, 471. Rimes in *-ie* are pure also, e.g. ll. 75, 123 etc. The same is true of the following rimes: *-ir* (mainly infinitives) 75, 413, 453, 457, 497 etc.; *-ire* 445, 455 etc.; *-ist* as *fist* : *prist* 117; *-it* 463, 495, 1175; *-is* 393, 399 etc.; *-ise* 361, 693, 1245; *-iz* 233. This *i* comes regularly from *-iei* as *mi* 278 and may be in rime with *i* < Latin *i*; cf. l. 471. In the protonic *i* appears also as *deliat* 1407; *otria* 249; septimus is represented by *sime* 1240 by analogy with *dime*, *disme* and the ending *-ime*.

In Agn. the spellings *ei* and *ie* are found sporadically, e.g. *preisa* 165, 168; *vierent* 1200. [St., pp. 185—7.]

§ 8. French *ĩ*.

This sound is represented by *-in* as *fin* : *chemin* 27, 1169; *enclin* 637; the rimes in *-in* are pure as too are those in *-ine* 697; *-int* 215, 425, 485. There is only one case of *-ein* for *-in*, viz. *veint* 1613. For *creient* see § 18. [St., p. 188.]

§ 9. French open *o* [ɔ].

A. ɔ < popular Latin *au*.

This sound is almost exclusively represented in Agn. by *o* and it would appear to keep its open quality intact; there is only one rime in our poem—*chose* : *pose* 533; other words are: *or, unkore, noe* 591; *estorer* 741; *loer* 56; *osum* 653; *oster* 1115; *otreia* 222; and the various parts of the verb *oïr*. The reading *out* 433 should doubtless be *ot* as in line 95 while the outcome of *apud* figures often as *ou* 238, 628, cf. § 24. For this *ou* cf. Miss Pope's *Étude sur la langue de Frère Angier*; St., p. 189 and S. § 13 c.

B. ɔ < Latin checked and atonic *ŏ*.

This sound is also generally represented by *o*; e.g. *col* 281; *cors* 347; *fors* 348; *fort* 610; *folie* 1425; *novele* 1549; *orer* 886; *volage* 239. Since the rimes in *-ose* are so rare in Agn. we may quote the following:

Adgar *chose* : *glose* 36. 42; : *rose* 9. 143.
Simund de Freine *chose* : *pose* St G. 855.
Vie de Ste Catherine *chose* : *ose* 1299 : *pose* 2063.
Chardry *repose* : *Theodose* S.D. 831; *rose* : *disclose* S.D. 623.
Vie de Ste Marie l'Égyptienne *chose* : *rose* 467.
Vie de St Richard *chose* : *parclose* 27.
Disputeison de l'ame et du corps *chose* : *rose* iv 3, 6.

Suchier (§ 13, a 4) admits as providing open *o* in French a number of borrowed words where *ŏ* or *ō* are in open syllables. [St., p. 189.]

§ 10. French close *o* [o].

French close *o* has doubtless the sound [u], i.e. *ou* in Agn. and the MSS. use this symbol very extensively. In our poem the words riming on this sound have generally *u*, e.g. *creatur* : *seigniur* 9; *honur* : *amur* 39; *tur* : *jur* 1103, 1149 etc.; other than in rime the stressed syllable is always represented by *u*, *curuce* 684; *dutuse* 109; *joiuse* 230; *mustre* 1; *tut* is also found as *tuit*, e.g. 48. In the syllable under secondary stress both *o* and *u* are found and occasionally *ou*: *sovent* 100; *doter* 35; *mustrer* 343; *purrum* 75; *oure, houre* 865 but *hore* 569; *nus, vus, cum, but, mut, dunc* always appear with *u* and spellings with *u* form about eighty per cent. of the whole; the spellings *ou* and *ui* seem rare: *voua* 124; *tuit* 381; *ou* < *o* + vocalised *l* remains. [St., pp. 190—91.]

§ 11. French *õ*.

Although *u* is so common for *o*, *un* is less frequent than *on*. In the rime words *on* occurs with only two exceptions—ll. 675, 773; the

first plural ending is always *-um*; *conseil* and compounds of cum- are regularly *com-*; *doner* is always so spelt; *son* is much commoner than *sun*, but curiously enough while *-ons* is always so spelt, *unt* is preferred without exception, the same is true for *-unde* 587; we find both *long* and *lung*, *longement* and *lungement*; the ending *-ion* is constant. The spelling *-oun* is rare. [St., pp. 191—2.]

§ 12. French *u* and *ũ*.

The sound is represented by two spellings, *u* and *ui*, the second is rare; there seems to be only one example in our poem: *estuit* for *estut* 1648. The rimes are pure, e.g. those in (i) *u* 81, 115, 505, 523 and in (B) 195, 309, 311; (ii) *ue* 67, 443; (iii) *ume* 875; (iv) *ure* 1, 355, 701, 991; (v) *us* 107, 561, 1223; (vi) *ut* 181, 1137; with one exception *aventure* : *oure* 547. As is common in Agn. de usquam appears as *deke*, *dekes*.

The nasal *u* is rare, it occurs once only in rime and offers no varieties in orthography. [St., p. 193.]

§ 13. French *ai*.

The sound *ai* began early to develop into *e*; among the first words to show this are *ewe* 273, *lermes* 1499 or where *ai* is followed by a heavy consonant group, e.g. *mestre* 209, *nestre* 193; later the change is found in any enclosed position. The change is more complete in Agn. than elsewhere and occurs in any position; the sound varies between close and open *e*. When *ai* was final it appears to have retained its diphthongal pronunciation throughout the thirteenth century. The change is explained as taking place through *ei* and all three spellings, *ai*, *ei*, *e*, are to be found. Examples of these are: *contraite* 1067; *fait* 138; *feit* 478; *treit* 168; *fet* 4; *mes* 238; *trere* 1196. This last spelling is perhaps commoner than either of the others. The reduction of *ai* to *a* seems only to occur in unstressed syllables, e.g. *paens* 763. The spelling *ai* occurs also for *ei*, e.g. *disaie* : *tuchaie* 201 (B). The rimes in *ai* are strikingly pure: (i) *ai diray* : *lay* 1559; otherwise this rime is furnished only by the ending of the first person of the preterite or future as in ll. 199, 315, 989; (ii) *ait mesfait* : *plait* 111; *ait* : *vait* 553; cf. also ll. 669, 933, 967 against an incorrect rime *vait* : *dreit* 899; (iii) *aire* pure for *faire* : *traire* 1355 and *here* : *trere* 1495 while for *feire* (< fēria) : *trere* 1195 we may assume that *ei* > *ai* before *ai* > *e* and this is supported by the modern spelling *fair*; the single rime in *-aite* is pure also, despite the spelling, *contraite* : *desheite* 1159. [St., pp. 193—6.]

§ 14. French *aĩ*.

This sound is generally represented by *ein*, e.g. *meins* 785; *pleint* 1242; *seinte* no other spelling; *seinteté* 236 etc. The rimes are with one exception pure, e.g. *mains* : *noneins* 785 (the spelling of the MS. is retained); *main* : *à plein* 781, 925, 943 (*plein* < *plano*, cf. G. Paris, *St Gilles*[1] xxvii); *drein* : *prochein* 871 but *main* : *sein* (< sinus) 667. The rimes in *aine* are, however, confused, *funtaine* : *meine* 799; *peine* : *semeine* 1295; that in *-aint* is pure, *remaint* : *plaint* 1125. The result of an enquiry I have made into these rimes in Agn. texts of the twelfth century[2] is as follows:

1. Philippe de Thaun:

(*a*) *Comput.* No examples of confusion.

(*b*) *Bestiaire.* One doubtful case, cf. Walberg, Introduction, p. xlviii.

2. *Reimpredigt.* No faulty rimes.

3. Gaimar. One faulty rime in *ain*, viz. *plain* : *serein* 767. Vising in his *Étude sur le dialecte anglo-normand du xii^e siècle*, p. 84 quotes as instances of confusion *grifaine* : *quinzaine* 3007 and *plein* : *main* 4033, but *grifaine* of the first is regularly found in rime with words in *-aine* and *aigne*, and *plein* of the second example might conceivably be for *plain*, such is the reading of one at least of the MSS.

4. Adgar, *Miracles.* Fifteen cases of confusion.

5. G. de Berneville, *St Gilles.* No confusion.

6. *Sainte Marie l'Égyptienne.* Only one clear case of confusion, *quarantaine* : *ceine* 747.

7. *Le Donnei des Amants* (*Romania* xxv p. 497 seq.). *sein* is found twice in rime with *main* 787, 801 and once with *vilein* 831.

8. Chardry. Two cases of confusion.

Our poem is therefore in this particular not more advanced than several poems that are older. [St., p. 196.]

§ 15. French *ei* (later *oi*).

This sound occurs in Agn. correctly only as *ei*, e.g. *dei* 1598; *eire* 258; *feire* 1195 (cf. § 13); *feiz* 346; *neir* 331; also *ei* < *e* + *n* and *l* mouillées as in *deignast* 343; *esmerveilliée* 302. The following spellings are also found: (i) *e* in *aparer* 617; *aver* 98; *mescrere* 1319; (ii) *i* in

[1] So also in Wace: *E prent quanque il treue a plein*, *Rou* 1698.

[2] I have, of course, noted special works on the subject as Vising, *o. c.* (1882) and Rolfs, *Adgarlegenden* in Vol. I (1883) of the *Romanische Forschungen*, though it will be noticed that I do not always arrive at similar results; this is due to the fact that better editions are now available.

damisele 274; *deviez* 1403; (iii) *oi* in *moi* 244; *damoisele* 315, 329. [Note these are only found in (B).]

The sound is probably still slightly diphthongal; it is only found in rime with itself as is shown by the following lines: (i) *-ei* in *fey* : *ley* 141, 423; *rey* : *mey* 451; (ii) *-eis* in *reis* : *Engleis* 131; (iii) *-eil* in *veil* : *peil* 689; (iv) *-eille* in *merveille* : *veille* 1193; (v) *-eir* in *veir* : *poeir* 509; (vi) *-eit* in *esteit* : *aveit* 517; *espleit* : *veneit* 559 : *dreit* 784 (cf. § 54 iv).

Our poem contains four instances in which *veie* < *via* is in rime with feminine past participles <*-ata*, viz. *alée* 811, *asenseie* 1185, *portée* 1207, *entrée* 1333. This is not a proof that *ei* has become *e* but that *é* followed by a feminine *e* has a tendency to diphthongise. There are instances of this in Frère Angier, e.g. *veies* : *remuées* (see Miss Pope's *Étude sur la langue de Frère Angier*, p. 11), and also in Chardry, *monée* < *moneta* : *dunée* and *aportée* [*Sept Dormanz* 1205, 1291]. For Chardry the rime doubtless indicates that *ei* has become *e* but our text presents another instance, viz. the rime *levée* : *desree* 537; here *desree* stands for *desreie* and is therefore another instance of *-eie* : *ée*. A similar rime is to be found in *Aïol*, a late twelfth century text with N.E. dialectic characteristics, *desree* : *trainée*, while like rimes are common in W. and S.W. dialects. It is one of the points of interest of Anglo-French to find it in agreement with continental dialects. Professor Stimming quotes (p. 175) a number of instances in which *ée* < *-áta* appears as *eie*, e.g. *espeie*, *valeie*. We have seen § 4 B above that *ei* is a recognised spelling for *e*, it is frequent in the Corpus Christi (Oxford) MS. of *Sainte Marie l'Égyptienne* where this sound occurs in the last word of a line. There is a tendency also in Agn. to insert *i* between the antitonic and the tonic vowel, e.g. *ayé* (< ætatem), *veyer* (< vetare) in *Boeve de Haumtone; loiée* (< laudata) in *Destruction de Rome* 32, an Agn. MS. of possibly some other dialect (cf. *Romania* II p. 5).

The forms *aver*, *poer*, *saver* etc. found frequently in rime in Agn. with infinitives of the first conjugation are probably cases of analogical formation (cf. P. Meyer in Bozon, *Contes*, p. lxii). Instances of this would seem to occur about the end of the twelfth century; the earliest examples I have met are in *Le Donnei des Amants* (dated by G. Paris at the end of the twelfth century); *aver* : *aler* 980, : *doloser* 1144; the cases quoted by Rolfs (*l.c.* p. 209) from Adgar are only in poems—*Gregory* and *The Abbess delivered by the Virgin*—of doubtful authenticity; in the remaining poems Adgar's rimes are pure. Our poem has one instance but only in (B), the doubly incorrect *targer* (for *targier*) : *saver*

303 and with this may be compared *esmaer* : *veer* (< videre) in the *Legend of Gregory* 1750 just mentioned.

[St., pp. 197—200 and 237—8.]

§ 16. French *eĩ*.

The sound is represented by *-ein* as *sein* 668; *ameine* 401; *peine* 402; for the rimes cf. § 14.

§ 17. French *ie*.

The sound is represented by *ie* and by *e*: (i) *ariere* 542; *chiet* 1361; *ciel* 8, 503; *fiert* 1664; *siecle* 36 (this word is generally so spelt in Agn.); (ii) *aider* 121; *cel* 377 (this spelling is rare compared with *ciel* which is found in texts which have elsewhere regularly reduced *ie* to *e*); *meuz* 89; *mester* 232 etc.; *neces* 154 etc.

The reduction of *iée* to *ie* represented by the orthography of ll. 1221—2 is not supported by a rime with *ie* < *i* + *a* etc. The rimes in *ié* are singularly pure. In the passages that may be ascribed to the original author no cases of mixed rimes, *ié* : *é*, are to be found; *posé* : *cungé* 1497; *loer* : *cher* 1497 are in the Episode we call (A). In the main body of the poem there are 145 rimes in *é* (*é, ée, ées, ef, el, er, ere, ez*) and 49 in *ié* (*ié, iée, iées, ier, iez*). In the passage we call (B) there are 18 pure rimes in *é*, 3 in *ié* and 8 mixed, viz. ll. 207, 209, 229, 231, 301, 303, 329, 367. Suchier has compiled a list (§ 29) of words which are found, now in rime with *ié* and now with *é*; of these our text contains—*regné* : *ensemblé* 428 : *volunté* 745; *malvesté* : *enticé* 1323; *deviez* (< de + vita + are) : *aler* 1403; *crier* : *deslier* 1585; *oublié* : *esté* 629. These may be left out of our calculations. The question of mixed rimes in Agn. is a very interesting one. In the earliest poets such infractions are rare but they steadily increase till a pure rime becomes a mere matter of chance. I have drawn up some statistics of the proportion of these mixed rimes in Agn. writers: thus we find

Author or work	No. of lines	Pure	Mixed	Proportion of pure to mixed
Gaimar	6534	586	9	65·1 to 1
Adgar[1]	6870	642	10	64·2 to 1
St Gilles	3794	489	12	40·9 to 1
Haveloc	1106	129	6	21·5 to 1
Sainte Marie l'Égyptienne	1534	171	13	13·3 to 1
Sainte Osith (A)	278	36	2	18 to 1
Sainte Osith (B)	about 204	21	8	2·62 to 1

[1] Adgar has the peculiarity of finishing so many of his legends with the words...*Dame chiere* : *preiere* that it is necessary to make some allowance; we have deducted therefore 40 from the number of pure rimes and from the number of total lines; the two poems named in § 15 have not been considered for this list; they contain many cases of mixed rimes.

I am not inclined to lay much stress on the proportion of pure to mixed rimes as a factor for determining the date of Anglo-French poems, but it is interesting to see how the proportion of mixed rimes corresponds roughly to the date of production. The matter of the dialect is too complicated for any one phenomenon to be decisive; it is necessary, as G. Paris stated (*St Gilles*, Introd. p. xxv) as long ago as 1881, to know something of the writer's upbringing. There is also the larger question: how many poets whose works show anglicisms are really English born or only immigrants? It seems fairly certain that Frère Angier came from a S.W. French province and that his language had become contaminated by residence in England[1]; the same, I believe, is true for the author of the *Destruction de Rome* (published in *Romania* I, pp. 1 seq.) who would seem to be a native of one of the North or North-Eastern provinces and by a lengthy stay in England could be content to allow such words as *celer* (l. 269) to find a place in a tirade of *ié* assonances or *chargié* (942), *asiegier* (1461), *Oliviers* (1501) etc. into others that contain only *é* assonances. [St., pp. 201—2.]

§ 18. French *ïẽ*.

The sound is represented by *ien* as in *bien* 5, 1270; *criendre* 106; it is reduced to *-en* only after *i* as *terrïen* 60; *crestïens* 768, 795. The spelling *creient* (ll. 3, 5) may also be noted here (cf. § 5, ii ϵ). The rimes in *-ien* are all pure; *bien* : *rien* 167, 389; *mien* : *rien* 437. Other Agn. authors are less careful; thus we have in Gaimar *ancienz* : *anz* 1785; in Adgar *crestiens* : *sens* 5. 101 : *tens* 6. 223 etc. Mention apart must be made of the word *nient*; it is monosyllabic in lines 47, 707, 1363 and dissyllabic in 576, 663, 845. It is generally found in rime with words in *-ent* as *entent* 663 and with adverbs in *-ment*, e.g. ll. 576, 846, 1392. This phenomenon is noticed in the earliest Agn. texts: thus in the *Bestiaire* (*nient* is not in rime in the *Comput*) we find that it is both mono- and dissyllabic and that it rimes in the same way as here (cf. Walberg's edition p. li). Gaimar has *nient* : *descent* 4019; Adgar *nient* : *gent* 31. 33 : *maintient* 30. 175 etc.; *St Gilles neent* (and *nent* 489) : *pulent* 222 : *verraiement* 1100. [St., p. 203.]

§ 19. French *ieu*.

This sound occurs in a very limited number of words and the spellings *eu* and *iu* are the most frequent; our text offers: Nominative

[1] See the work quoted in § 15. This would seem to be true for Marie de France, whose later works show anglicisms such as the earlier ones do not contain; see G. Paris' review of *L'Espurgatoire* in *Romania* XXIV p. 290 seq.

case, *Deus* 117, *Dieu* 434, *Deu* 1423; Acc., *Deu* 31, and *Dampnedeu* very frequent for both cases. The form used for purposes of the rime is commonly in Agn.[1] and many French dialects *Dé*, e.g. : *overé* 1206. We find also in our poem *geu* 992; *giu* 478; *liu* 192, 924.

[St., p. 204.]

§ 20. French *ȯi* [ɔi].

Very few words with this diphthong exist; it is represented here by *oi* and *oy*, e.g. *oi* (< habui) 318; *soi* (< sapui) 320; *poy* (< paucum); this last is the common form in Agn. In the dialect of our text we find that *ȯ* + *l* mouillée gives *oil* and we have *doil* 1116; *oilz* 502; and *voil* : *soil* 1475. The word *soil* does not appear in Godefroy in the Latin sense of seat which it appears to have in line 1476 but only in the sense of *souiller*. We have also the rime *estoire* : *memoire* 97; this is a stock rime in Old French, in fact only the learned words can be used for the purpose. Instances of this are—*Bestiaire, gloire* : *victoire* 205. Gaimar uses as rime words: *estoire, gloire, memoire, tempoire, victoire*, see ll. 3239, 3311, 5711. Adgar uses *estoire* and *memoire*. Most Agn. scribes write *-orie* but this is not the case in our MS.

[St., p. 204.]

§ 21. French *ói* [oi].

The diphthong is somewhat rare, it occurs in Agn. as both *oi* and *ui*, e.g. *voiz* 383; *anguisse* 517; *ui* appears to be preferred in the protonic as *anguisuse* 389 and *fuison* 1464. [St., p. 205.]

§ 22. French *oĩ*. This too is rare, it appears as *oin* and *uin*, e.g. *doint* 349 etc., *luintain* 187, *puignant* 549. It does not appear in rime.

[St., p. 205.]

§ 23. French *ȯu* [ɔu].

This sound only occurs in our text in verb forms: *out* < habuit 1441; *plout* < placuit 1442. This favourite rime in Agn. only occurs here twice and with the foregoing words. For the ending *-out* in imperfects of the first conjugation, see § 54 iv. [St., p. 205.]

[1] The treatment of *eu* and *ieu* in rimes needs special investigation: for *Deu* it is interesting to note that certain texts only rime with a limited group of words e.g. Gaimar *Deu* : *feu* (germ. fehu) 4321, : leu 1410; Adgar, *Deu* : *Jueu* 5. 13 : *Andreu* 19. 51 and this is also true for *Brandan*; whereas Philippe de Thaon, Fantosme, Sanson de Nantuil, *St Gilles*, *Ste Marie* and also Wace rime *Deu* with any word in *é* < *a*. But for the rarely occurring Nominative *Des* or *Deus* the rimes available seem to be few (cf. § 32). Thus in the *Bestiaire Des* : *esperitels* 195; Gaimar : *remes* 3601. The rime of *e(u)s* so frequently with *remes* may be more than a mere coincidence and may indicate a labialised pronunciation of *e* (cf. § 4) for we have the rimes *remes* : *tex* in Benoit, *Troie* 19495 : *Idomenes* ibid. 28921, : *ostels*, Wace, *Rou* III, 4869, 4888 and frequently in Chrestien de Troyes, : *Kes*, *Yvain* 2179; : *ostels*, *Erec* 5697; : *Gres*, *Cligés* 3623, 4212.

§ 24. French *óu* [ou].

Few words only contain this sound. Here we have *dous* and in (B) *deuz* 346 and *amedeuz* 341. The outcome of *ubi* is *u* 188 and *ou* 367; *ou* is often found for apud (cf. § 9) and in its place our MS. has *eu* (ll. 390, 392). [St., p. 206.]

§ 25. French *ue*.

This sound is represented in a variety of ways:

(i) *ue*: *estuet* 392; *iluec* 617, 1108; *puet* 190; *suer* 1095, 1217, 1220, 1229; *quer* 305.

(ii) *u*: *estut* 35; *iluc* 1008; *vus* (for *vues* or *veus* < vŏles) 1141.

(iii) *oe*: *poeple* 488; *iloec* 298.

(iv) *o*: *ilokes* 875; *volent* 664; *bor* (also *bour* 31) 1424.

(v) *eu*: *leus* 323; *peut* 121; *seur* 242.

(vi) As the outcome of aviolus our text has *aels* instead of *aieus*. We have considered *voil* and *soil* in § 20; the form *seur* is found in (B) in rime with *amur* 221 and with *ducur* 241, cf. § 43 iv. [St., pp. 206—7.]

§ 26. French *uẽ*.

The spelling *uen* seems almost unknown in Agn. Peter of Peckham (*St Richard*) has *suens* side by side with *seens*, which form occurs in our text 1542; the pronoun from homo is *l'em* 94, otherwise homo and bonum only give *hom* and *bon*. [St., p. 209.]

§ 27. French *ui*.

This sound is found in our poem represented by *ui* and *u*. Most of the rimes are pure, e.g. *bruit* : *tuit* 999; *ennui* : *sui* 643; *fuire* : *destruire* 767. In Norman and Anglo-Norman *ui* is often reduced to *u* when *s* follows and in Agn. in conjunction with other letters. This *u* may then rime with original *u*, e.g. *jut* : *duit* 297, 1121; *us* < *uis* : *us* < usum 1121. There are no cases in our poem of rimes of *ui* with *i* such as are to be found elsewhere, e.g. Gaimar *qui* (< cogito) : *midi* 1645; *transit* : *quit* 5137; Adgar *qui* : *ami* 28. 143. Nor are there instances of *ui* : *oi* as *destruiz* : *croiz*, Adgar 30. 31. [St., p. 209.]

Consonants.

§ 28. Liquids.

There is no rime in our poem to prove that *l* is vocalised; no *pout* : *volt* as e.g. *St Gilles* 3619; on the other hand there is nothing to prove the contrary. The same is true curiously enough for Adgar, *Haveloc*,

and *Sainte Marie l'Égyptienne*, while the proof of vocalisation for Gaimar rests on the evidence of a single rime *enchascout* : *volt* 2003.

It is possible that the rime of ll. 601—2 discussed in § 4 is a case of the vocalisation of *l*. This absence of any decisive rime must be a matter of pure chance. Here as in many Agn. works *l* often remains in the orthography as in *al* 281, 518 and *del* 691; these forms are normal; our poem has also *aels* 205 (cf. § 25); *malgré* 96; *malvesté* 1324; *l* is inserted in *alme* 691, and by the scribe reduced to *u* in *espaumes* 891; *paume* 892; *voudrai* 642. It has disappeared after *u* in *ducur* 178. Sporadically in Agn. we find *a* + *u* < *l* reduced to *a*; instances in our text are *chevache* 601; *acune* 858; *sav(er)ast* 119[1]. This is not a mere scribe's error as is proved by the English *save*. Other examples I have met are *savaciun* in *St Richard* 6 and *maveis* in *Modwenna* 17 d.

The *l* mouillée is represented by *-il* when final, e.g. *conseil* : *merveil* 265 and intervocalic by *-illi-* as *ailliurs* 6; *fillie* 130 etc., or by *-ili-* as *perilié* 972. There is no rime in our poem of *l* with *l* mouillée as is often the case in Agn., e.g. *soleil* : *feeil* in *Bestiaire* 2233; *gopil* : *il* in Gaimar 281 etc.; *fedeil* : *conseil* in Adgar 28. 57; *Marsile* (= *Marseille*) : *vile* in *St Gilles* 1035.

The metathesis of *r* seems only to occur in *pernum* 100, *pernent* 773, *pernunt* 1035. Anglo-Norman texts show great confusion with this consonant and spell the same word, now with *r* and now with *rr*, as e.g. *orez* 108, *orrez* 113. A number of cases of double letters are treated together in § 41.

The pronunciation of *r* in Agn. is very weak, so that *r* in combination with another consonant may be found in rimes with that consonant. Instances of this are found from the earliest times, thus: *Bestiaire, sage* : *large* 7; *cors* : *enclos* 291; Gaimar, *ancestre* : *geste* 827; for Adgar *certes* : *estes* is in the Gregory legend 1468.

In Agn. texts *r* and *l* are often found in rime as *Bestiaire, nature* : *nule* 103; Gaimar, *apostoile* : *Theodorie* 1387; Adgar, *cler* : *alter* 30. 95, while elsewhere he only uses the form *altel* (: *el* 2. 93); *St Gilles, apostoile* : *estoire* 561. No clear case of this exists in our poem as the rime *mariners* : *juvencels* 883 is best emended as in the footnote to the text.

[St., pp. 210—5.]

§ 29. Labials.

There is little to note about this group of consonants; *p* is inserted

[1] For this reading cf. § 53, 1, B.

in *Dampnedeu* (cf. § 19); *b* after *m* has disappeared in our text, e.g. *colum* 1040; *f* remains in the orthography before flexional *s*, as *cerfs* 558, *nefs* 868; *f* final remains in *tref* 275 and in the rimes *nef* : *tref* 945; *belif* : *restif* 949. For rimes of *-um, -umb-* see Walberg's edition of the *Bestiaire*, p. lvi. [St., pp. 219—20.]

§ 30. Nasals.

Final *n* and *m* are not separated in the rime; *non* < nomen : *gueredon* 7 : : *compaignon* 419. This is, however, not very conclusive as a distinction is made in the *Comput*, where *un* and *um* are confused but not *n* and *m* preceded by other vowels. The distinction is perhaps only a chance one since in the *Bestiaire crestïen* rimes with *l'em*, while Gaimar has *faim* : *demain* 325. Adgar would seem to treat these consonants as does Philippe in the *Comput* but Suchier—*Reimpredigt*, p. lii—attributes this to pure chance.

In the group *rn* as *ivern* 267, *n* disappears in the rime, e.g. *jur* : *blanchur* 597; *tur* : *dolur* 63. This change is noted from the earliest times: though in the *Comput* the rimes are not quite conclusive, in the *Bestiaire* we find *jur* : *honur* 249, in Gaimar *jur* : *seignur* 319 and in Adgar *jor* : *salveor* 3. 7. Satisfactory proof may often be lacking as is the case for *Sainte Marie* and the *Reimpredigt*. The change is early on the continent, Chrétien de Troyes has *retor* : *amor* in *Yvain* 6511. Before labials *n* > *m* as *emfler* 860; *empensé* 632; it seems to have disappeared from *wydas* = *windas* in *St Gilles* 803 etc. (cf. Chaucer, *windas*, see Skeat's Glossarial Index). *N* mouillée is written *-gni-* when medial as *seigniur* 651 or *n* as *remaine* 725; *ng* when final as *lung* 275 (for various spellings of *n* mouillée see Hildebrand in *ZfrPh.* viii 321). In compounds of *cum*, *n* frequently disappears before *v* as *cuvint* 426, *couveite* 445. [St., pp. 215—9.]

§ 31. Dentals *t, d.*

Dentals isolated between two vowels have disappeared as is shown by the following rimes: *mie* : *vie* 11, *vie* : *amie* 75, *amie* : *hunye* 441 etc. With final dentals matters are not quite so simple in Anglo-Norman. The isolated dental become final in French has been lost in our poem in

(*a*) substantival and verbal roots:

fei < fidem : lei < legem 423; *cri* : *ci* 1119; *crei* : *rei* 255. These often rime with themselves as *vei* < vido for video : *dei* < ditum = digitum (cf. Adgar 17. 949).

(*b*) terminations, *é* < *atum*; *i* < *itum* or palatal + *edem*; *u* < *utem*, *utum*:

Dé : *overé* 1367; *gey* : *di* (< dico), *merci* : *issi* 649; *veu* : *fu* 927. (Abstract substantives and the past participles often rime among themselves as in the ll. 21, 93, 95, 129, 143, 153 etc.)

(*c*) preterites in *i* < *ivit*:

entendi : *autresi* 1357; *fini* : *issi* 351; *nasqui* : *si* 187. (Preterites of this kind are also found in rime with past participles: as *servi* : *trai* 695 and also preterites, *servi* : *guerpi* 57.)

(*d*) preterites in *-a, -at* rime only with themselves or with a future:

alat : *enmenat* 411; *deliat* : *deliverat* 1407; *mustra* : *verra* 1423. This proves nothing however as other rimes in *a* are rare, practically only *la* and *ja*.

(*e*) strong preterites and other words with fixed *t* rime with themselves:

mist : *cunquist* 1439; *fist* : *dist* 1263; *vait* : *ait* 554; *aït* : *dit* 1589; *petit* : *lit* 495; *plait* : *mesfait* 111. In line 904 we find the form *plai* (cf. *plait* above), this is rare (see Godefroy) but certain Norman texts have it in rime with words without fixed *t*, as *plai* : *delai* in *Chronique des ducs de Normandie* 16252 (for other instances, see Walberg, *l.c.* p. lx).

(*f*) There is an isolated case of *-st* riming with inchoative present:

ist < exit : *empourist* 691 (cf. Adgar, *nurist* : *dist* 17. 669 and § 59). *Esperit* appears normally in rime with fixed *t*, e.g. *respit* 463; in Adgar the word is in rime with *eslit* 6. 154 and with *delit* 6. 309.

This would prove that final *t* is lost. If the *t* is silent in the cases above mentioned, *a fortiori* will it be in *-et* < *-at*; although we may admit cases of hiatus yet the cases of elision are regular and prove that the *t* was entirely lost by the time our poet wrote.

When we compare this phenomenon with other Agn. texts we find:

Philippe de Thaun, *Comput:* one case of *t* riming with fixed *t* but in a line that is not well supported by MS. evidence; it may be a case of analogy.

Bestiaire: no cases.

Gaimar: some cases of preterites in *-i*, e.g. *partit* : *dit* 2514. These are best explained as analogical forms, but it should be noted that certain verbs in *-ir* show a tendency to join the weak class.

Adgar: no cases.

Sainte Marie: instances only with weak forms as (*f*) above.

The rime *païsant* : *manant* 185 may be compared with *tyrant*,

parchment, ancient. Wace, Ambroise and Gervaise and other continental writers admit these forms which are due to analogy with the ending of the present participle and words like *enfant.* [St., pp. 221—4.]

§§ 32, 33. *s, z.*

The distinction between *s* and *z* (Latin *t* + *s*) at the end of words is absolute[1]. Rimes in *-is*, e.g. *quis* : *ris* 477 ; *mis* : *amis* 671 ; *assez* : *entendez* 113 etc. are all pure. There are only two apparent exceptions *respiz* : *envis* 459, *delez* : *pres* 323, but these are clearly mis-spellings ; *envis* is for *enviz* (< invitus) : *marriz* in Benoit and with *pluriz* in *St Gilles* 3240 and *pres* is for *prez* (< pratos). There are one or two instances of confusion in the *Bestiaire* but Adgar[2], *St Gilles, Ste Marie, Le Donnei des Amanz* and *St Richard* are all alike in making the distinction.

The *s* before consonant is silent for our poet ; this is proved by the following rime in *-est*, i.e. *fest* (= *fait*) : *plest* 197 ; other rimes are not quite satisfactory : *dist* (for the past participle) : *fist* 217 is not conclusive as it occurs in (B) and *dist* : *respit* 499 is probably a mistake for *dit.* Other rimes are the strong perfects in ll. 111, 1337, cf. § 31, while the rimes in *-est*, viz. *est* : *cest* 543 ; *est* : *prest* 571, prove nothing.

For the scribe the mutation of *s* is proved (i) by the omission of *s* as in *acemée* 171 and when final in *for* 774, 1003 (cf. *St Gilles* 914) ; (ii) by its insertion when not authorised by the orthography, e.g. *aturnast* 1099, *mestez* 436, *neste* 353 etc. ; (iii) by the characteristic Agn. change of *s* + *l* to *dl* in *madles* 47, *entremedlé* preserved in English *meddle* < *medler* < *mesler.*

As to the spellings we find *s* or *ss* where we now write *c* in *purchasé* 477, *issi* 483 and also *sc* for modern *ss* in *richesce* 167.

The outcome of *-itium* is *-ise* in our poem, e.g. *servise* : *guise* 1245, : *eglise* 1301. The former pair is also in the *Bestiaire* 2269. On the continent we have *servise* : *aprise* in the *Cligés* 1779 and with *esprise* in the *Énéas* 1269. [St., pp. 224—30.]

§ 34. *c* = k.

This sound is represented in our text by :

(*a*) *k* in *kar* 110 etc., *illokes* 875.

(*b*) *qu* in *quor.*

(*c*) *c* in *iluec* 617, *iluc* 1008. [St., p. 231.]

[1] The rime *sëus* (cf. § 43 iv (*b*)) : *vëus* 561 is a poetic licence ; the word *sëus* is rare ; I have only found it once in rime in Agn., viz. Simund de Freine : *seüs* : *fus* (*St Georges* 1044).

[2] In the Gregory legend we find : *enfes* : *enpensez* 1576, while Gaimar has *purpens* : *deuz* 181—2 ; *feiz* : *reis* 923 and some dozen further cases of confusion.

§ 35. *qu.*

The spellings *k* and *qu* are found indifferently: thus we have *ky* 101, *kant* 108, *unkes* 191 (but not *unques*) and *qui* 1178, *que* 406, *quant* 99, *quanque* 164. [St., p. 234.]

§ 36. *c* [ts].

This sound coming from *c* followed by *e* or *i* or from *cj* or *tj* preceded by consonants other than *s* is retained here, as in *ciel* 8, *comence* etc. The neuter pronoun is *ce, ceo* (cf. § 50). The spelling *-sc-* is met here as elsewhere (e.g. Gaimar, Adgar, Simund de Freine etc.) as in *manascer* 703. [St., p. 233.]

§ 37. *ch* [*tʃ*].

This sound comes regularly from *c* + *a* or *pj*; the first of these sources is represented by *chant* 306; *chef* 64; *chemin* 1261 and—with the spelling *sc*—by *seneschal* 1469, *meschines* 800; and the second by *sachez* (cf. § 54). Certain words occur in Northern French forms: *desaka* 289; *saké* 932; *secke* 353. As is common in Agn. the present subjunctive of *saveir* is *sace* (cf. § 55 III). [St., pp. 235—6.]

§ 38. *g* [g].

The *gu* coming from Germanic *w* is written *g* or *gu* before *a* and *gu* before *e* or *i*: *gages* (=*vague*=*wave*) 861, also *Énéas* 246; *garder* 1688; *garrir* 1090; *garisun* 1234; *guerpist* 7. Original *cr* > *gr* here as elsewhere, *graventa* 292; *granter* 1214. [St., p. 236.]

§ 39. g [dʒ].

We find both *g* and *j*; the former generally before *e* and *i* as *gesir* 299, *geta* 1241 but only *jekes* 191, and medially, *targié* 576; *j* is preferred before *o* and *u* as *joïr* 199, *jur* 301 but *gal* (for *jal*) 306. [St., p. 237.]

§ 40. *h.*

Aspirated *h* is retained in *haschie* 1222, *hernaschant* 913, *hors* 561, *huchent* 540, *hurte* 600, and *h* appears in certain words when it should be absent: *herbe* 192, *houre* 861, *hui* 334; we have *abit* 654 and *oure* often. [St., p. 239.]

§ 41. Double letters.

Anglo-Norman scribes are especially fond of double letters, our text presents the following:

ll *apellé* 128, 636.

rr *dirrai* 376, 986 etc.; *querrez* 67; *guarriz* 1175; *irra* 250; *verrai* 1286.

dd redde 587.
cc succurs 294.
ss essample 100. [St., p. 239.]

§ 42. The article.

The nom. sing. form *li* is very common and is retained even when the noun has lost its distinctive nominative form, e.g. *li tierz jur* 330; *li pautener* 1356; it is also found with elided *i* before nouns beginning with a vowel as *l'em* 94. In the pl. masc. *li* is also very common but the *i* of this form for no clear reason is not elided before a vowel[1]. For the article in combination with *a* and *de* cf. § 28.

A few remarks may be made on the syntax of the article:

1. Nouns are frequently found without the article, when the noun has a general sense as *a rei* 426; *apres saluz* 326, cf. too ll. 836, 876, 1303, 1309, 1330, 1432; and after certain verbs, e.g. *hurte chival* 600[2].

2. With parts of the body, side by side with the use of the possessive adjective, e.g. 667, 670, 817, 818, 825, 925 etc., we find *as piez lur chiet* 1361; *les piez li ad desseelez* 1409.

3. As a demonstrative[3]:

Seinte Osith fu le jor *alée* 797 = that day.
A l'aube del jur la matinée 269 = that morning.

The use of *le jur* seems fairly common in Old French as: *Cel jor i fu Looïs alevez, E la corone mise desus l'altel; Li reis ses pere li ot* le jor *doné. Cour. de Louis* 45—7. His father had given it (sc. the crown) to him that day. Further in Agn. Gaimar: *Franceis, Engleis* le jor *perirent* 5418; *St Gilles* has several instances: *Male guarde firent* le jur, *Quant il perdirent lur seignur* 3661–2 and also ll. 719, 2640, 2797; *Haveloc: Malement lur avint* le jor 110. The persistence of the demonstrative force in modern French as shown by the phrases *de la façon* (e.g. Est-ce de la façon que vous voulez l'entendre, Molière, *École des Femmes*, iv 4), *de la sorte, pour le coup, à l'instant*, etc. has been pointed out by Tobler, *Ver. Bei.* ii p. 44.

A. T. Baker.

Sheffield.

[1] Cf. Rydberg, *Zur Geschichte des französischen* e, p. 420 seq.
[2] Cf. Fredenhagen, *Über den Gebrauch des Artikels*, Halle 1906, p. 48.
[3] Brunot, *Grammaire historique* i, p. 232, remarks that the primitive nature of the article continued to be felt in the sense that it could take the place of the demonstrative and quotes: *Ço dist li reis*: '*Al Jesu e al mien!*' = for that (sc. the honour) of Jesus and my own (*Roland* 339; cf. too 3145 *ibid.*).

(To be concluded.)

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

Pope's 'Rape of the Lock.'

Some of the passages in earlier writers to which Pope was apparently indebted in *The Rape of the Lock* appear to have escaped the notice of his commentators.

Lydia. Indeed, dear sir, my face would frighten back the sun.
Dapperwit. With glories more radiant than his own.
Wycherley, *Love in a Wood*, Act II, sc. i.

Compare

Sol through white curtains shot a tim'rous ray,
And ope'd those eyes that must eclipse the day.
Canto I, 13, 14.

and

Not with more glories, in th' etherial plain,
The sun first rises o'er the purpled main,
Than, issuing forth, the rival of his beams....
Canto II, 1—3.

The name Dapperwit is introduced in Canto V, 62[1].

In Dryden's *Tyrannic Love, or The Royal Martyr* the following lines occur in a speech of the Spirit Damilcar:

We wander in the fields of air below,
Changelings and fools of heaven; and thence shut out,
Wildly we roam in discontent about:
Gross heavy-fed, next man in ignorance and sin,
And spotted all without, and dusky all within.
Act IV, sc. i, 177—181.

Compare

The graver prude sinks downward to a gnome,
In search of mischief still on earth to roam.
The light coquettes in sylphs aloft repair,
And sport and flutter in the fields of air.
Canto I, 63—66.

[1] Since writing the above I have noted that Pope was probably indebted to Thomas Stanley's lines in the 1657 edition of John Gamble's 'Ayres and Dialogues (To be sung to the Theorbo-Lute or Bass-Violl)':

On this swelling bank, once proud
Of its burden, Doris lay:
Here she smil'd, and did uncloud
Those bright suns eclipse the day.

(P. 9 in Miss L. I. Guiney's edition of Thomas Stanley's Original Lyrics, J. R. Tutin, Hull, 1907.)

Gilbert Wakefield, while failing to note the passage in *Tyrannic Love*, quoted 'The realms of ocean and the fields of air' from Dryden's *Aeneid*, i, 196.

Dryden's 'dusky' may have been in Pope's mind when he wrote

> Umbriel, a dusky, melancholy sprite. Canto IV, 13.

In Dryden's *Conquest of Granada* the line

> You bane and soft destruction of mankind,
> Part I, Act III, sc. i, 317.

may be compared with

> This nymph, to the destruction of mankind,
> Nourish'd two locks. Canto II, 19.

Pope's interest in the Latin poems of the Italians and his obligations to Vida, for example, are well known. It is not improbable that in more than one place in *The Rape of the Lock* he was indebted to Aonio Paleario's *De Animorum Immortalitate.* The first book of this poem begins thus:

> Felices animae, caeli omnipotentis alumni,
> Astrorum decus, et qui versicoloribus alis
> Aethera tranatis liquidum, qui sidera, quique
> Volvitis ingentes magnis anfractibus orbes.

With 'versicoloribus alis' may be compared

> Colours that change whene'er they wave their wings,
> Canto II, 68.

while the last two lines of the Latin seem to have suggested

> Some in the fields of purest ether play,
> And bask and whiten in the blaze of day.
> Some guide the course of wand'ring orbs on high,
> Or roll the planets through the boundless sky.
> Canto II, 77—80.

The *De Animorum Immortalitate*, though not included in Atterbury's ΑΝΘΟΛΟΓΙΑ *Seu Selecta quaedam Poemata Italorum qui Latine scripserunt*, Cambridge, 1684, was among the poems added in the revised edition of that collection which appeared in 1740, London, 2 vols., with Pope's name as editor.

To return to Dryden's *Tyrannic Love*, there is a likeness between the speeches of Amariel, the Guardian-Angel of St Catharine, in which he reminds the spirits of their various duties and threatens them with punishment for their neglect, and the address of Pope's Ariel to the sylphs and sylphids.

Compare

> Hence, to the task assigned you here below!
> Upon the ocean make loud tempests blow;
> . . . . . .
> From pointed sunbeams take the mists they drew,
> And scatter them again in pearly dew.
>
> Act IV, sc. i, 163—168.

with

> Ye know the spheres, and various tasks assign'd
> By laws eternal to th' aërial kind.
> . . . . . .
> Or suck the mists in grosser air below,
> Or dip their pinions in the painted bow,
> Or brew fierce tempests on the wintry main,
> Or o'er the glebe distil the kindly rain.
>
> Canto II, 75—86.

It may be a mere coincidence, but, in view of the parallels already cited it is curious that while Dryden in *Tyrannic Love* applies the terms 'magic fumes' and 'powerful steams' (Act IV, sc. i, 192, 193) to the fumigation by which the spirits are drawn down, Pope uses 'fuming liquor' (Canto III, 114) and 'fragrant steams' (III, 134) of the coffee in the *Rape of the Lock.*

Cowley was an early favourite of Pope's, and a connexion may be traced between

> Love walks the pleasant mazes of her hair,
>
> *The Mistress*, 'The change,' I, 2.

and

> Love in these labyrinths his slaves detains, Canto II, 23.

and

> Some thrid the mazy ringlets of her hair, Canto II, 139.

In Canto V, 108,

> And chiefs contend till all the prize is lost,

Pope seems to have taken a hint from Statius, *Thebais* I, 1, 'alternaque regna profanis | Decertata odiis.' Pope in his translation, published at the same time as the *Rape of the Lock,*

> Th' alternate reign destroy'd by impious arms,

evidently followed Caspar Barth's interpretation of 'decertata,' 'perdita atque amissa concertando.'

Edward Bensly.

Aberystwyth.

Pope's 'Windsor Forest,' 65, 66.

> The fields are ravish'd from th' industrious swains,
> From men their cities, and from Gods their fanes.

Pope's own note on the couplet is 'Translated from

> Templa adimit divis, fora civibus, arva colonis,

an old monkish writer, I forget who.' This statement has been reprinted again and again, but editors generally appear to have accepted Pope's obliviousness with resignation. Joseph Warton, it is true, wrote 'In Camden's *Britannia* first edition, in the account of Somersetshire, it is said of Edgar,

> Templa Deo, templis Monachos, Monachis dedit agros.'

But this line from the epitaph of King Edgar, which, by the way, does not occur in the *first* edition of the *Britannia*, merely shews a certain parallelism in form. Warton, however, came curiously near Pope's real source. In the *Britannia*, under 'Hantshire,' Camden quotes certain lines which he attributes to John White, bishop of Winchester (*ob.* 1560),

> Templa adimit divis, fora civibus, arva colonis
> Rufus, & instituit Beaulensi in rure forestam.
> Rex cervum insequitur, Regem vindicta; Tirellus
> Non bene provisum transfixit acumine ferri.

With regard to White's poems John Pits, *Relationum Historicarum de Rebus Anglicis Tomus Primus*, 1619, p. 763, says of 'Ioannes Vitus,' 'Scripta huius praeclari viri, ipso auctore in vinculis moriente, pene omnia simul perierunt, praeter quaedam carmina' and mentions, p. 764, in a list of his productions, 'Epigrammatum & aliorum Poëmatum Liber vnus. Nubat vt Hispano Regina,' adding 'Vidi aliquando Oxonii MS. exemplar.'

Edward Bensly.

Aberystwyth.

Fielding's Signatures in 'The Champion,' and the Date of his 'Of Good-Nature.'

There seems still to remain some doubt that the papers signed *C* and *L* in *The Champion* of 1739—40 are by Henry Fielding. The following bit of evidence in the matter has, as far as I have been able to learn, not yet been noticed in print.

The first signed paper of *The Champion*, according to the reprint of 1741, is that of November 24, 1739. The signature is the two stars commonly assigned to James Ralph. The next paper, that of November 27, 1739, bears the signature *C*. In it the writer says: 'I should be sorry to think there was in Mankind the Principle pointed at in the following Lines, which I have taken from a Poem not yet communicated to the Public.

Nor in the Tyger's Cave, nor Lion's Den,
Dwells our Malignity. For selfish Men,
The Gift of Fame like that of Money deem;
And think they lose, whene'er they give Esteem.'

The poem referred to is *Of Good-Nature, To his Grace the Duke of Richmond*, the second poem in Volume I of the 1743 edition of Fielding's *Miscellanies*. The next to last paragraph of this poem reads in that edition:

Dwells there a base Malignity in Men,
That 'scapes the Tiger's Cave, or Lion's Den?
Does our Fear dread, or does our Envy hate
To see another happy, good, or great?
Or does the Gift of Fame, like Money, seem?
Think we, we lose, whene'er we give Esteem?

This would indicate that Fielding wrote the first *C* paper. As the 'Advertisement' in the 1741 edition of the collected *Champions* of November 15, 1739—June 19, 1740, states that the essays signed *C* and *L* are the 'Work of one Hand,' we may conclude that this quotation in the first *C* paper goes far to show that Fielding *did* write the *C* and *L* papers.

Further, the quotation demonstrates that Fielding had written at least part of *Of Good-Nature* before November 17, 1739. The form of the quotation as compared with the 1743 text, shows that he revised at least the one paragraph of the poem after November 17, 1739, and before the appearance of the 1743 edition. These facts concerning the poem have not, I believe, as yet been noticed in print.

John Edwin Wells.

Beloit, Wisconsin, U.S.A.

On Certain Poems of the Hawthornden MSS.

In my article 'Some Unpublished Poems of Drummond from the Hawthornden MSS.,' which appeared in the July number of the *Modern Language Review* (Vol. VI, p. 324), I stated that Drummond was so much in the habit of transcribing passages or entire poems from all kinds of

authors that of the pieces ascribed by me to him one or two might, in spite of the precautions I had taken, turn out not to belong to Drummond. I am now indebted to Professor Grierson for pointing out that of the two poems quoted by me on p. 333, one, 'On a Flye,' belongs to Carew, and the other, 'Prayer going to Bed,' to Thomas Browne (in the *Religio Medici*, Pt II, § XIII). Mr J. T. T. Brown had previously written to me drawing my attention to the fact that the 'Prayer going to Bed' was to be found in Browne's *Religio Medici*. Mr Brown also had doubts concerning the ascription to Drummond of the trifle beginning 'The Gods have heard my vowes' (p. 332 of my article), though he was not able at the time to trace the piece.

I need hardly add that I shall be thankful for any further corrections.

L. E. KASTNER.

MANCHESTER.

A NOTE ON TENNYSON'S 'MORTE D'ARTHUR.'

> For so the whole round earth is every way
> Bound by gold chains about the feet of God.

Various suggestions have been made as to a literary origin for the metaphor applied to prayer in these lines[1]. None of the similar passages quoted, so far as I know, apply to prayer. The following passage, however, from the *Divine Names* of the Pseudo-Dionysius does furnish the exact parallel.

'Let us then elevate our very selves by our prayers to the higher ascent of the Divine and good rays,—as if a luminous chain being suspended from the celestial heights, and reaching down hither, we, by ever clutching this upwards, first with one hand, and then with the other, seem indeed to draw it down, but in reality we do not draw it down, it being both above and below, but ourselves are carried upwards to the higher splendours of the luminous rays'[2].

[1] Professor Churton Collins (*Illustrations of Tennyson*, London, 1891, p. 158) declared that 'the germ of the two fine lines...is of course to be found in Homer (*Iliad*, VIII, 25—6).' He compares also Plato (*Theaetetus*, CLIII, 10), Bacon's *Advancement of Learning*, book I, *ad init.*:—'According to the allegory of the poets...the highest link of nature's chain must needs be tied to the foot of Jupiter's chair';—and Archdeacon Hare's *Sermon on the Law of Self Sacrifice*: 'This is the golden chain of love whereby the whole creation is bound to the throne of the creator.'—Any reminiscence of Plato or Homer in this passage is denied by the present Lord Tennyson on his father's authority (*Poems of Tennyson*, annotated by Alfred, Lord Tennyson, ed. Hallam, Lord Tennyson, London, 1907, I, 389).

[2] *On the Divine Names*, transl. Rev. John Parker, London, 1897, p. 27 f.—Prof. R. M. Jones (*Studies in Mystical Religion*, London, 1909, p. 110, n. 2) remarks that this passage is 'almost certainly a memory of the beautiful passage in Clement of Alexandria (which is apparently from Tertullian, *De Testimonio Animae*).'

It is the easier to believe that Tennyson's metaphor was a reminiscence of the passage here quoted, because Professor Rufus M. Jones has already pointed out[1] other reminiscences of the Pseudo-Dionysius in Tennyson. Mrs Verrall, moreover, has drawn attention to a probable influence of a similar sort in her note on *A Possible Reminiscence of Plotinus in Tennyson*[2].

Hope Emily Allen.

Cambridge.

A Jest of Goldoni's in Goethe's 'Faust.'

Goethe became acquainted with Goldoni's plays when he was a student in Leipzig: several of these were performed during the Easter Fairs, and Goethe refers to one of them in his letter to Behrisch of October 16, 1767. *Gli Impostori*, *Due Gemini*, and *Pamela* were amongst the comedies adapted for the German stage before that date[3], but one of the most charming of all Goldoni's works, *La Locandiera*, was not translated before 1770, when it appeared in the seventh volume of J. H. Saal's collection of the complete works of Goldoni[4]. This translation, *Die Gastwirthin*, was performed three times by Weimar amateurs under Goethe's direction in 1777[5]. Ten years later Goethe witnessed an Italian performance of the same play, and in 1788 he published an account of it of some length in an article contributed to Wieland's *Merkur*, on 'Frauenrollen auf dem römischen Theater von Männern gespielt'[6]. When he resumed his work on *Faust* soon after this date, he evidently remembered the *Locandiera*, and in versifying the scene in Auerbach's Keller he introduced a jest which is not contained in the *Urfaust* of 1775. That he owed it to Goldoni is proved by the use of the foreign word 'judiciren.' In the *Locandiera* a small glass of wine is offered to the Marchese who replies: 'Non tanto piccolo il bicchierino. Il Borgogna non e liquore. Per giudicarne bisogna

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 105, n. 1, p. 107. The references are to the *Ancient Sage* (*passim*), and to *In Memoriam*,

> The Great Intelligences fair
> That range above our mortal state. (lxxxv, st. 6.)

[2] *Modern Language Review*, July, 1907, Vol. II, p. 327 f.

[3] L. Mathar, *Carlo Goldoni auf dem deutschen Theater des XVIII. Jahrhunderts*, Munich Dissertation, 1910.

[4] *Des Herrn Carl Goldoni Sämmtliche Lustspiele*, Leipzig, 1767—77. Cp. Mathar, pp. 180 ff.

[5] *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, IV, p. 114.

[6] Goethe's *Werke* (Weimar Ed.), XLVII, pp. 273 ff.

beverne a sufficienza.' In *Faust* Frosch answers Mephistopheles, who gives his own wine to the students:

> Schafft Ihr ein gutes Glas, so wollen wir Euch loben.
> Nur gebt nicht gar zu kleine Proben;
> Denn wenn ich judiciren soll,
> Verlang' ich auch das Maul recht voll.

ROBERT PETSCH.

LIVERPOOL.

METTRE AU RANCART.

I have looked in vain for a satisfactory etymology of this expression. I suggest that *rancart* may be a dialectal corruption of *hangar*. Observant people who have travelled in Normandy and conversed with the peasants must have noticed that initial *h* is so strongly aspirated (or rather expirated) as to resemble a German *h*. In certain districts, notably in and around Caen, and in the 'Vallée d'Auge' this aspiration has become so strong as to cause a vibration of the uvula, resulting in a decided palatal *r* (see Nyrop, Vol. I, § 487). At Pont l'Evêque, 'la haie,' 'le houx,' 'le hangar' are commonly pronounced *la rée, le rou, le rankar*, and friends of mine who are natives of Calvados confirm the accuracy of my impression. The sense of the phrase points in the same direction, for the *hangar* is the place where objects or implements not in actual use would naturally be put away.

H. E. BERTHON.

OXFORD.

DISCUSSIONS.

Piers Plowman, One or Five.

Having only just found time to read the latest developments of this discussion in the *Modern Language Review*, may I speak a word for the many who are perfectly willing to admit Prof. Manly's theory upon adequate evidence, but who feel at every fresh turn the inconclusiveness of what has hitherto been alleged? Mr Chambers seems to have shown conclusively that the argument from linguistic and metrical differences is (to say the least) premature; he has also given a clear and closely-reasoned exposition of what many of us had dimly felt all along, that Sloth's confession and the names of the wife and children might quite well stand where they are. But Dr Bradley, while admitting much of the force of these arguments, still insists upon 'the curious irrelevance of B's confession of Wrath.' He apparently feels, with Prof. Manly, that this 'contains no very distinctive traits of Wrath,' but might almost as well be Envy. Yet I cannot help thinking that all this rests upon a misapprehension of medieval facts as definite and as fatal as the misapprehension (now admitted) of that crucial word *win*.

Prof. Manly's objection seems exaggerated even on the surface. B's personal description of Wrath, with which he quarrels, is exactly that of a man in bestial anger, showing the whites of his eyes and grinning like a dog, with lowered head ready for attack[1]. We ourselves may easily live a polite threescore years and ten without ever seeing these things; but nobody doubts that B (whether separable or inseparable from A and C) was familiar with elemental and unvarnished humanity. Again, even on the surface it is obvious that he who impels nuns to jangle with their tongues, and to proceed through 'thou liest and thou liest' to actual fisticuffs and potential murder, can scarcely be other than Wrath. So far, then, B's description answers to the name he gave it, and cannot without violence be transferred to Envy. But the further objection seems to rest upon a more subtle misapprehension.

[1] Cf. Darwin, *Expression of the Emotions*, chap. x. 'Anger'; 'The dilated nostrils quiver'; 'According to Gratiolet, the pupils are always contracted in rage'; 'Eyes dilated ...head inclined forwards'; 'This protrusion of the head and body seems a common gesture with the enraged.' In chapter xi., on the other hand, Darwin confesses himself unable to give Envy 'any fixed expression, sufficiently distinct to be described or delineated.'

Prof. Manly and Dr Bradley, both writing under necessary pressure of space, seem briefly to hint at what Dr Furnivall plainly expressed, that our direct and powerful A would not so have beaten about the bush; *his* Wrath would not have been content to fritter away his energies among mere monks and nuns, when he might have done so much more harm in the wide world outside. No philologist of our own day would have thus expressed Wrath: therefore poor B of five hundred years ago, who wrestled daily with things rather than with words, and had to bring his thoughts to birth as best he could, stands condemned as a blunderer.

I contend, on the contrary, that it would scarcely have been possible to choose any better field for Wrath in the fourteenth century England —any field in which he could have worked more freely or caused more scandal. Apart from that eternal and world-wide dispute between the Friars and the secular clergy to which B refers, the intestine quarrels of the Religious were frequent and inevitable—is it not notorious, for instance, that the daily routine of monotonous privations among the same small company sometimes stretches the patience of modern Arctic explorers almost beyond human endurance? Indications of this kind are so common in monastic records, and so obvious when once realized, that I have long ceased to keep notes of them: but a post-graduate prize-essay has lately been written here in which the author (Mr R. H. Snape, of Emmanuel) is so struck by the frequent records of monastic quarrels in episcopal visitations, that he seeks to account for them by a theory of his own, which of course need not concern us here. Again, taking down almost at random a famous book on monastic discipline (the *Speculum Disciplinae* long attributed to St Bonaventura, but really written by his secretary, Bernard of Besse), I find the following passage (Pars II, c. vi. § 7): 'Hence it befalleth that we see many [Religious] who contemn the greatest things [in the world] for Christ's sake, yet still keep the old Adam in the smallest things, and are moved to wrath for a writing-stylus, for a needle, for a pen. They are lightly provoked and puffed up, as men who possess not apostolic charity.' This passage supplies both the points we need to justify B; (1) the frequency of the phenomenon, and (2) the force which it derived, for moral purposes, from its inconsistency with the monastic ideal and the scandal which it gave to the world at large. Gower, in his *Vox Clamantis*, IV. 169 ff., dwells emphatically on the wordy wars that went on in monasteries; even when the rule of silence compelled the monks to talk on their fingers, then 'loquax digitus...in rixis plus meretrice furit.' Cf. the 'Frater Odium' of l. 1103 below. Moreover, Etienne de Bourbon, going similarly through the Seven Deadly Sins, gives only two anecdotes of Wrath proper, the first of which refers to a Béguine 'so wrathful and quarrelsome that she frequently afflicted and disturbed the rest *by her many revilings*.' Neither here nor in the next story does Etienne take his wrathful people beyond 'thou liest and thou liest': to him, the picture was complete even without those buffetings and murderous desires which Prof. Manly so strangely blinks in B. Yet Etienne was

a preacher of remarkable force and success, who knew the world of his time inside and out.

But Dr Bradley holds that 'the omissions and alterations of the C-text considerably lessen the inappropriateness of the confession.' So far as this is so, C does not here show himself so blundering as we are sometimes told. But let us look into details. (*a*) C's one addition of importance, at the beginning, does indeed *broaden* the picture considerably; but it does not in the least imply that C found in B that want of *concentrated* force which (it is now contended) shows him to have been a different man from A. On the contrary, C's quarrel with B's picture (if quarrel there was) was precisely with its narrowness and concentration. (*b*) C's main omission, again, does not bear out Dr Bradley's contention; he omits the sentence in which B describes the revelation of sacramental confession as a possible effect of Wrath. His object in this omission was, *ex hypothesi*, to remove one of B's traits which was 'more suitable to Envy than to Wrath.' But, though we all know that the seal of confession was fairly frequently broken in the Middle Ages, yet the temporal and spiritual consequences of such a crime were so serious and so well known that few were likely to blab in cold blood. For one priest who broke the seal of confession because Envy gnawed at his breast, we may fairly assume that ten did so under the 'brevis furor' of Wrath. Therefore, whatever may have been the motive of C's omission, it can scarcely have been that which Dr Bradley implies. As to the other changes which he emphasizes, but without specification, I would only plead Prof. Manly's words 'B's wrath he [C] leaves with little change' (*E.E.T.S.* 139 c. 27 or 109). And, to avoid all misapprehension, may I conclude by echoing the gratitude already expressed by others to Prof. Manly for having inaugurated this new stage in the criticism of *Piers Plowman*?

G. G. Coulton.

Cambridge.

REVIEWS.

The Cambridge History of English Literature. Edited by A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller. Vol. vi. The Drama to 1642. Cambridge: University Press. 1910. 8vo. x + 533 pp.

In the review devoted to the fifth volume of this invaluable work, and published in the July number of *The Modern Language Review*, the space demanded for a due consideration of the chapters on Shakespeare necessitated a postponement of our review of the last two chapters of that volume. These chapters concern 'the lesser Elizabethans' (using the last word strictly), and the social and political conditions of the reign in their influences on the drama. In the former Mr Ronald Bayne has cleared up much that we know only from the confused accounts and memoranda of Henslowe. It is worth recognising, for example, that there were no 'lesser dramatists' in the Greene-Marlowe group: 'The lesser dramatist is the result of the extraordinary interest in the drama which these authors created': and further that 'we have to wait some years before the work of lesser writers survives sufficiently to enable us to appraise it.' Nevertheless Munday, Chettle, Haughton, Porter and others, humbler workers in Henslowe's mart of theatrical trade, assume position and character under Mr Bayne's hand, and the touch of their work with that of greater men is skilfully suggested. We are glad to find the robust vigour of Porter's *Two Angry Women of Abington* rated at its true value, and welcome the hint as to its probable influence on Jonson. In the final chapter of the fifth volume Dr Ward brings together with grasp and discernment the political and social aspects of the age as affecting the stage, marking the conditions in which the Elizabethan drama reached its height and contrasting them with the symptoms of what was to come.

Turning to the sixth volume, we find Professor Thorndike leading off with an adequate and orthodox account of Jonson and his work, in which he properly distinguishes (as it has not always been distinguished) the quality of the poet's avowed classicism, and happily attributes to his 'impeding garrulity' and 'absence of charm,' the circumstance that the judicious (whose opinion alone Jonson did not disdain) lend an intellectual assent to the poet's literary qualities, but warm only to the man. Jonson's development from romantic drama into the comedy of humours, which became his forte, is well brought out; and

Professor Thorndike refuses to follow Creizenach in his denial to Jonson's authorship the brilliant 'additions' to *The Spanish Tragedy*. Nor is the second chapter on Chapman, Marston and Dekker by Professor Dixon less informing and satisfactory. The vital defect of Chapman's dramatic art is touched in the words 'he never learned to think in any character but his own'; the personal character of Marston is rescued, with much show of justice, from the critical obloquy under which it has often suffered; and the enduring poetic charm of Dekker and especially the essentially English quality of his art is recognised to the full. We could wish greater attention to have been paid to Mr Robertson's recent discussion of *Alphonsus of Germany*, with his denial of the authorship of it to Chapman[1]; and the alleged collaboration of Chapman with Shirley in *Chabot* and *The Ball*, slender as is the evidence, deserves perhaps a fuller treatment. Is it Shirley's hand that gives to the former effective play not only its clarity of plot and directness, but that power of pathos which Professor Dixon justly denies to Chapman elsewhere?

The separation of the qualities that mark the lithe and supple genius of Middleton from the grosser yet essentially larger nature of Rowley in works of their joint authorship has already formed the subject of scholarly comparison; but never has this distinction been so effectively drawn and with such a fine feeling for its subtleties as in the chapter by Mr Symons on these poets. The swiftness and sureness of Middleton in his verse as in his prose; how Rowley, less articulate, but infinitely more imaginative and therefore truer to the verities of life, lifted the range of Middleton's vision and humanised his art, all this and much more of this interesting collaboration is set forth with admirable critical discernment. Withal Mr Symons seems scarcely just to Rowley's rare play, *A Shoemaker a Gentleman*, now accessible in reprint together with his forcible and sincere, if overdone, *All's Lost by Lust*[2]. In the fourth chapter the long and chequered dramatic career of Heywood is followed by Dr Ward, and his primacy in the domestic drama, together with his estimable modesty as a man and a playwright, is duly emphasized. Particularly interesting is the critic's justification of the credibility of the author in his famous statement that he had 'either an entire hand or at the least a main finger' in two hundred and twenty plays. Features of Mr Macaulay's treatment of Beaumont and Fletcher which follows are his excellent contrast of the versification and poetic manner of Fletcher and Shakespeare; his showing more clearly than heretofore how Fletcher was the innovator, while Beaumont was more distinctly in affinity with the older Elizabethan school; and his recognition in Massinger of a capacity superior to Fletcher's in the conduct of an entire plot, however happy Fletcher may be in the management of single scenes. In view of the preternatural

[1] *Did Shakespeare Write "Titus Andronicus"?* pp. 123 sq.

[2] *William Rowley his 'All's Lost by Lust' and 'A Shoemaker a Gentleman' with an Introduction on Rowley's place in the drama*, by C. W. Stork, *Publications of the University of Pennsylvania*, XIII. 1910.

precision with which some critics of late have assured us that at such and such a line Beaumont laid down the pen and Fletcher took it up, it is refreshing to read from one so long experienced in these vexed questions, 'When a critic, with no external evidence of authorship before him, concludes that a certain play was originally written by Beaumont, afterwards revised by Fletcher and finally rewritten by Middleton, he is evidently dealing in mere guesswork.' Suggestive, too, is the conclusion: 'It is probable that the popularity of Beaumont and Fletcher on the stage in the latter part of the century, together with the acceptance of their language by Dryden as a standard of pure English, had more influence than is commonly acknowledged upon the development of English style during that period in the direction of classical simplicity.'

Professor Koeppel's presentation of the dramatic art of Massinger is as able as it is thorough. After setting forth the somewhat intricate relations of the poet to the Pembroke family, chief hereditary patrons of the poets, the author summarizes in several direct paragraphs the quality of Massinger's excellent dramatic art, and especially the nature and the limitations of his power to draw character. To the alleged cases of Massinger's apparent sympathy with the Roman form of worship might well be added the figure of the efficient and beneficent Jesuit, Francesco, in *The Renegado*. Perhaps it might be asked, if Massinger's 'use of alliteration is very discreet,' how can it be likewise 'in most cases undoubtedly unconscious'? And why mention 'tricks of the euphuistic style,' even to note their absence in a poet who did not begin to write until this aberration of style in prose and of strictly Elizabethan times had become a thing of the past for a generation? It cannot be that a critic of Professor Koeppel's eminence and nationality could be infected by the loose and unscientific employment of this word which, in a recent notable history of English poetry, dubs a whole generation of writers 'poetical euphuists.'

Of Cyril Tourneur, if Professor Vaughan will pardon us, we really know a little more than 'the dates at which his plays and poems were published.' He appears to have been a son or at least a relative of Captain Richard Turner, 'water-bailiff of Brill,' and spent several years in the Low Countries, acting temporarily as secretary to the council of war on the occasion of the expedition of 1625 to Cadiz[1]. As to the two tragedies that custom has associated with his name, their difference in quality, design and character of diction is such that we should prefer to raise the question of the possibility of one man's authorship of them both, rather than remain content, as does Professor Vaughan, with this difference for determining priority in composition. Professor Vaughan has not done justice to these extraordinary plays by his remark that the characters for the most part are 'either puppets or incarnate abstractions of various virtues and vices.' Nor do we feel

[1] G. Goodwin, *The Academy*, May 9, 1891, p. 442, and the references there given to the *Calendar of State Papers*.

more satisfied with the suggestion that the *Northward, Eastward* and *Westward Hoe* series is to be regarded mainly as an 'afterswell' of the famous war of the theatres. Quicksilver, in *Eastward Hoe*, with his pranks and his conversion, is a capital take-off of the whole class of idle apprentices of the day, and the entire play is gently satirical of the city. The other two comedies belong to the Middletonian species, and needed no allusion to excellent old Chapman to make up their coarse conventional merriment. While Professor Vaughan was looking for satirical allusions, why did he omit the good natured gibes at *Hamlet* in *Eastward Hoe*? We are glad, in view of these little 'dissensions,' to commend the adequate treatment of the difficult subject of Webster with which this chapter concludes: for however the other greater dramatists rise into success at times in their poetry, their characterization, or in the handling of the plot, Webster alone with Shakespeare attained that sense of a depth beyond, dominated by an impenetrable tragic gloom, which gives his two master tragedies their place among the highest triumphs of the romantic conception of life.

In the eighth chapter on Ford and Shirley Professor Neilson begins with an excellent distinction. Recalling the publication of the folio of Shakespeare in 1623, he finds that previous playwrights have been students of the playhouse, but these for the first time students of literary drama. The remark is of course truer of Ford than of Shirley, whose touch with the stage remained to the end close and intimate; but indubitably there is a literary air about the drama of the time of King Charles that does not belong to the stage in the days of his predecessors. Professor Neilson's treatment of Ford suggests the growth of the dramatist's romantic unorthodoxy with regard to the tyrant passion love and the subtle casuistry with which he defends it, and refers his plays to a larger number of sources and influences, it may be surmised, than Ford, who was emulous of originality, would himself have confessed or perhaps even have recognized. It would be interesting to know more of Mr Sherman's surmise (in an unpublished thesis, which the present reviewer has not seen) that *Volpone* may have influenced *The Fancies, Chaste* and *Noble*, or how the philandering of Gascoigne's *Ferdinando Jeronimi*, which is pure comedy, could have affected the intricate, serious motive of *Love's Sacrifice*. Professor Neilson's treatment of Shirley is eminently fair and sound. Conventional with all his ingenuity was Shirley, and resonant with echoes of the great drama of the past, but it is difficult to prove him decadent. There is an unobtrusive wholesomeness about him and his competent art which falls into contrast alike with the rhetorical Massinger and the hectic Ford.

And now having traversed this great drama, leaping from peak to peak, with a cheerful disregard for things below, we descend to the 'lesser Jacobean and Caroline dramatists': unhappy adjectives that, unlike Elizabethan, denote only the accidents of time. It is difficult to follow Mr Bayne in his idea that Day in his *Ile of Gulls* created 'a new dramatic type.' Happier, it would seem, is his reference of Day's light

art in comedy to the impulse of Lyly, with suggestion, so far as he could follow it, from Shakespearean comedy. The comparison, too, of Lyly's lyrics, the epigrammatic flavour of which is the best argument against depriving him of them, to those of Herrick seems unhappily wide of the mark. This chapter with its enumeration of names and brief words of characterization is perhaps as well done as the impracticable conditions of the problem would permit. Let us think of political history or any other subject, written on this impossible plan. The biographies and deeds of the kings and greater men, written up in chronologically consecutive chapters, and then all the lesser things gathered together. The doings and campaigns of the great Caesars in eight chapters, the ninth on the City of Rome, the tenth on plebeians and patricians, the last on art and coinage. The present reviewer has no desire to be captious, but he feels that no true picture of the trend and development of our great drama can be received where the method is that of successive printing in several colours, first all the blacks, then all the reds, then all the greens, yellows and blues, each changing, and modifying the whole picture which must be held provisionally in mind until the last block comes from the press. Here in the tenth chapter of a second volume on the drama up to 1642 we first reach an account of the Elizabethan stage and the constitutions of the old theatrical companies; and the historic quarrel between the city and the court, which so deeply affected the course of things theatrical, especially in very early times, is reserved for a final chapter. Possibly these defects are inseparable from the cooperative plan which has none the less much to recommend it; and yet apparently the history of literature is the only subject that remains tethered to biography and the chronology of accidental publication.

Returning to our immediate business, it would be difficult to find a more temperate and informing chapter than that of Mr Child on The Elizabethan Theatre. We could wish that there were space to expatiate on its capable use of the most recent material and its many other good points. Professor Manly's contribution, too, an account of the Chapel Royal, puts in order a subject hitherto in great confusion and little correlated in its true significance to the history of the drama. We are glad to find the author taking a negative view of Professor Wallace's idea that Queen Elizabeth actually established and maintained a theatrical company in the Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars. But why cast 'historic doubts' on Thomas Preston and his authorship of *Cambyses*? Better men than Preston did not disdain to use the drama in academic wise and Preston with all his honours upon him belonged precisely to the class of Gager, Legge, Gwinne and the rest.

In the scholarly chapter (XII) by Professor Boas on University Plays we have a genuine contribution to an interesting subject, until lately not consecutively treated nor otherwise than sporadically investigated. Many of the academic dramas mentioned in this chapter are set forth as to their contents and character for the first time and the proportion and development of the subject are happily preserved. Professor Boas

has used effectively, too, the recent contributions to this subject, especially those of Professor Moore Smith, who has made the field of the English Latin drama his own. The chapter on the masque once more by Mr Bayne, offers several suggestive points. Among them the essentially non-dramatic character of the masque as such; the existence of the antimasque, despite Jonson, implicit in the masque from the first; and above all the example of Spenser in the creation of a visual, beautiful unreal world, precisely that in which the masque with its allegory and mythology was subsequently to revel. Happy is the designation of Jonson's genius in the masque as 'Aristophanic' in its 'combination of robust naturalism and imaginative fancy'; and the full recognition accorded to that great master for the admirable quality of his comic vein in the masque is as just as it is novel. With a well-considered chapter on the Puritan attack upon the stage, by Mr J. Dover Wilson, beginning in the Middle Ages and extending to the closing of the theatres, the sixth volume concludes.

In a review necessarily made up of such a multiplicity of detail, where facts jostle theories (even if theories do not jostle facts) and argument treads on the heels of criticism, it is impossible to do adequate justice to the many and genuine merits of this work. Despite a general plan that sacrifices much to the object of getting things together under a biographical title or a generally inclusive one, such as 'Political and Social Aspects,' 'The Children of the Chapel,' 'The Puritan Attack upon the Stage,' the editors have succeeded in giving a surprising degree of equality to the diverse contributions; and the tendency of the specialist to assume a knowledge of his facts in order to gain space for his theories has been judiciously curbed. Nothing but praise, too, is to be bestowed upon the carefully prepared bibliographies and incidental appendices. Altogether it is a fortunate augury for the future of scholarship that a work, enlisting the cooperation of Germany, France and America, wherever the torch of English learning is upheld, should thus proceed in its successful progress towards completion.

F. E. Schelling.

Philadelphia.

Shakespeare's Roman Plays and their Background. By M. W. MacCallum. London: Macmillan. 1910. 8vo. xvi + 666 pp.

The general merits of Professor MacCallum's volume—its comprehensive survey of its subject, its sound scholarship, its lucid and attractive style, its skilful analysis of character—have already been widely recognised by reviewers and by students. It will therefore be advisable in the present notice not to enlarge upon these points, but to deal mainly with some features of the work which are perhaps specially suitable for discussion in the pages of *The Modern Language Review*.

I am glad to see that in his Preface Dr MacCallum makes so handsome an acknowledgement of his indebtedness to F. A. T. Kreyssig,

'one of the sanest and most suggestive expositors that Shakespeare has ever had.' The tribute is well deserved, and it has been a real loss to Shakespearian study in England that Kreyssig's lectures have never been translated. To other commentators, both English and foreign, Dr MacCallum makes frequent and appreciative reference, and in the main he has succeeded in keeping 'abreast of the literature on the subject.' But there is one surprising omission in the list of authorities from which he quotes. More than thirty years ago Prof. Paul Stapfer wrote *Shakespeare et l'Antiquité*, which was 'crowned' by the French Academy, and of which the first Part, 'Greek and Latin Antiquity as presented in Shakespeare's Plays,' was translated by Emily Carey in 1880. The last ten chapters of this work discuss Shakespeare's relation to Plutarch and the chief characters in the Roman History plays. They anticipate in their method and spirit the treatment of these subjects in Prof. MacCallum's volume, though the scale is much narrower, and the psychological analysis far less subtle. Has Stapfer's work escaped the Australian Professor's notice? Or did he think that in the light of his own more comprehensive treatment no reference to it was needed?

To some readers the most interesting part of Dr MacCallum's work will be the 'Introduction,' 167 pages in length, which forms almost a fourth of the volume. The section on 'Roman Plays in the Sixteenth Century' includes an illuminating discussion of the plays of the French Senecans, Muretus, Jodelle, Grévin, and Garnier. The connection between the *Julius Caesar* of Muretus, the *César* of Grévin and the *Cornélie* of Garnier is clearly traced. The filiation is especially important because Kyd translated *Cornélie* in 1594, and internal evidence suggests that Kyd's version in its turn influenced Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*. On this point Dr MacCallum adopts a peculiar attitude. He recognises that the dialogue between Cassius and Marcus Brutus in Shakespeare's play, Act I, Scene 2, resembles in 'its whole tone and direction' that between Cassius and Decimus Brutus in *Cornélie*, Act IV, Scene 1, and that there is nothing at all similar in Plutarch. He even in his Appendix A quotes the nearest parallels between the plays, both in the French and the English versions, yet he concludes that 'the grounds for believing that Shakespeare...was influenced by Garnier's *Cornélie*...are even at the best precarious' (p. 61). This seems to me to understate the case in favour of the Garnier-Kyd influence upon the great dramatist. Shakespeare's Cassius throughout is so much more akin to the Cassius of Garnier than of Plutarch, that it is difficult to believe that the resemblance is accidental. It is more reasonable to suppose that Shakespeare's library contained *Cornelia*, which in the year of its publication by Kyd, 1594, was coupled by an elegist with the Stratford poet's *Lucrece*.

It is curious, with Dr MacCallum's keen interest in the neo-Senecan precursors of the Shakespearian Roman plays that he should apparently not have heard of the anonymous academic drama, *The Tragedie of Caesar and Pompey or Caesars Revenge*, acted at Trinity College, Oxford. It was entered in the Stationers' Register on June 5, 1606,

and two editions are extant, one undated (but probably the earlier), the other dated 1607. Internal evidence of style proves unmistakeably, in my opinion, that this play belongs to the last decade of the sixteenth century, and that Prof. Parrott in his interesting article upon it (*Mod. Lang. Review*, Vol. v, No. 4) is mistaken in thinking that it was composed in 1606. As the first Act is reprinted in the current *Shakspere Jahrbuch*, and as the full text is on the point of being issued by the Malone Society, it will soon be accessible to scholars, and they will be able to form their own views. Can Shakespeare on his visit to Oxford, when *Hamlet* was performed, have heard of the Trinity play, and was he thinking of it when Polonius in Act III, Sc. 2 says of his acting at the University: 'I did enact Julius Caesar: I was killed i' the Capitol; Brutus killed me'? However this may be, he is not likely to have seen it in manuscript, and there is not the faintest trace of it having influenced his own *Julius Caesar*.

But whether Shakespeare in his Roman plays owed anything or nothing to earlier dramatists, their true 'ancestry' as Prof. MacCallum, of course, shows, is to be sought in Plutarch—Amyot—North. His discussion of the relation of the Greek, French, and English versions of *The Parallel Lives* to one another is admirable. Even to serious Shakespearian students Amyot is apt to be a somewhat shadowy figure. The account here given of his career and character, of his scholarly enthusiasm and limitations, of his importance in the development of French prose, is highly illuminating. Such a passage as the following may be quoted in illustration of Dr MacCallum's style and critical method:

> Amyot could not on account of his position deliver a facsimile of the Greek. Plutarch lived at the close of an epoch, he at the beginning. The one employed a language full of reminiscences and past its prime; the other, a language that was just reaching self-consciousness and that had the future before it....At the worst Plutarch's style becomes mannered and Amyot's infantile. By no sleight of hand would it have been possible to give in the French of the sixteenth century an exact reproduction of the Greek of the second. Grey-haired antiquity had to learn the accents of stammering childhood[1].

Equally penetrating is the study of North's relation to Amyot. After pointing out the deficiencies of the Englishman's version as compared with that of his French original, Prof. MacCallum redresses the balance in North's favour as follows:

> He may be more licentious than Amyot in his treatment of grammar, and less perspicuous in the ordering of his clauses, but he is equal to him or superior in word music after the English mode; and he is even richer in full-blooded words and in phrases racy of the soil. Not that he ever rejects the guidance of his master, but it leads him to the high places and the secret places of his own language.

[1] Another, less elaborate, study of Amyot's work and his relation to Plutarch and to North appeared a little later than Prof. MacCallum's, in Sir Sidney Lee's *The French Renaissance in England*. Attention is there called to a monograph by M. René Sturel entitled *Jaques Amyot, traducteur des Vies parallèles de Plutarque* (1908). This treatise probably did not come into Prof. MacCallum's hands, as he does not mention it.

The vernacular character of his diction gave a national hue to his subject, and he thus 'supplied Shakespeare with the only Plutarch that Shakespeare could understand.' The dramatist in his three Roman plays borrowed, in varying quantities, the diction of North and the subject-matter of Plutarch. Hence in *Antony and Cleopatra* there is 'a maximum of Plutarch and a minimum of North'; in *Coriolanus*, 'the maximum of North with the minimum of Plutarch'; in *Julius Caesar*, 'the mean influence of both Plutarch and North.'

All this is in a general way known to Shakespearian students. But nowhere, as far as I am aware, is the problem handled with such precision, delicacy, and insight as in this chapter, which is, to my mind, the most masterly section of the whole work.

Even when he gets to his main task, the discussion in detail of the three Roman plays, Dr MacCallum is at his best when he is dealing with the larger aspects of the subject. Shakespeare's transmutation of his material in *Julius Caesar*, the position of *Antony and Cleopatra* and the union in it of a history, tragedy, and love poem, the situation in Rome in *Coriolanus* as represented by Plutarch and the dramatist respectively—topics such as these are handled with refreshing vigour and subtlety. The criticism has here a breadth and spaciousness worthy of its themes. And there are incidental phrases that stick in one's memory such as 'the flame-tipped welter of *Titus Andronicus*, the poignant radiance of *Romeo and Juliet*.'

But Dr MacCallum's critical method is, in my opinion, less successful when employed in elaborate dissection of individual characters. It is not that he fails either in erudition or in psychological insight—far from it. But he goes into such minute detail that our interest tends to become absorbed in the process of interpretation instead of in the personages themselves. Thus he takes twenty pages to expound what is essentially the same view of 'the titular hero' in *Julius Caesar* as Prof. Dowden sets forth in four pages of *Shakespeare's Mind and Art*. The cumulative effect of the long-drawn-out studies of the isolated characters is to make us forget at times that we are dealing with plays at all. We do not expect in a work like this disquisitions on the technicalities of (say) the platform-stage, but we are justified in reminding the critic that Roman plays have as their 'background' (to use his own phrase) not only North's *Plutarch*, but the Elizabethan theatre. His failure to take this fact sufficiently into account tempts him to attach too much significance to speeches and actions which were conditioned not by literary or ethical but by theatrical considerations.

Nevertheless the volume, as a whole, is one of the most stimulating additions made in recent years to Shakespearian literature. It is to be hoped that the author will not delay in following it with his projected supplement on the treatment of the Roman play in England by Shakespeare's younger contemporaries and Caroline successors.

F. S. Boas.

London.

Spenser's Minor Poems. Edited by Ernest de Sélincourt. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1910. 8vo. xxxii + 528 pp.

This is the companion volume to Mr J. C. Smith's edition of the *Faerie Queene*, published in 1909, and completes the Oxford edition of Spenser's Poetical Works. It goes far to supply for the first time a satisfactory text of Spenser's Minor Poems, that is to say, a text which is not only sound in itself, but which is accompanied by such full information with regard to the readings of the early authorities, that the reader can use his own judgment, and test that of the editor, almost as well as if he had the originals before him. This is far from being the case with the previous editions. Morris gives a very accurate text on the whole in the Globe edition, but his critical notes leave much to be desired. In the *Shepheardes Calender*, for example, he has before him apparently two only of the five quartos, the first and the fifth, though he occasionally cites also the readings of others, and the folio of 1611, and his selection of various readings from these is quite arbitrary, so that nothing can be inferred from his silence. For example, in the February eclogue, l. 8, he reads 'Perke as a Peacock' and fails to note that the first quarto has 'Perke as Peacock'; in l. 21 he makes no mention of the reading 'Ne never,' which is that of the fifth quarto and the folio; in l. 137 he omits to mention the alteration of the folio; in l. 176 he rightly gives 'woundes' in the text, but omits to mention that the quartos and the folio have 'wounds'; and so on. For various reasons also the editions of Todd, Child, Collier and Grosart are either untrustworthy or unsatisfactory.

'The aim of this volume,' says the editor, 'is to present a trustworthy text of the Minor Poems of Spenser, based upon a collation of the editions published in the poet's lifetime with the Folio of 1611.' The text is based in each case upon that of the first edition published, the only one which we can be sure was in direct contact with the author's handwriting, and every deviation from the text of these first editions is supposed to be recorded in the footnotes. With regard to the other editions the editor proposes to note every verbal change, and all those variations in spelling and punctuation which seem really significant, but he has rightly refrained from overloading his notes with an accumulation of orthographical variants of no interest, which would have made it difficult for the reader to obtain the information which he really requires. In the case of most of the poems the editor has to deal only with a single early edition and the folio of 1611, but of *Daphnaïda* there are two quartos, and of the *Shepheardes Calender* no fewer than five, to be collated. The tale which is unfolded by the history of the text of the last-named poem is the familiar one of gradual degeneration, each edition being printed from the preceding one, with some few corrections, but a greater number of added errors, and there is the usual absence of all effective supervision by the author (excusable in Spenser's case, for he was for the most part in Ireland) and of all systematic reference to earlier editions than that from which the

printers were working. In happy unconsciousness of their own errors, and acutely aware of the fact that they were correcting some of the mistakes of their predecessors, they always imagined apparently that continuous progress was being made towards perfection; and when they found an obvious error, they preferred to correct it by conjecture, rather than to refer to the first edition, where in most cases the author's own text might have been found. This does not mean that corrections in a later edition are never taken from earlier ones, but there was no systematic reference back, and for the most part no correction by the author, though an occasional suggestion probably came from him sometimes. In the *Shepheardes Calender*, for example, the emendation in the third quarto of 'overcrawed' for 'overawed' (Feb. 142) must surely have come from the author; in the fifth quarto the correction 'wrethed' for 'wretched' (May 186) points perhaps to a consultation of the first or the second quarto[1], and in the folio such readings as 'sithes' for 'sighes' (Jan. 49), 'followe' (June 75), 'yclad' for 'clad' (Nov. 113), 'she sweeter' for 'sweeter' (Aug. 72), suggest a similar conclusion, though in a multitude of other cases the misreadings found in the fifth quarto were accepted by the editor of the folio without reference to earlier editions. Professor de Sélincourt ought not, I think, to say with reference to the *Shepheardes Calender* that 'F often preferred conjecture to research'; the remark is not justified by the instances which he gives, one of which appears to be mistaken and the other is probably only a misprint, and there are in fact very few cases in which the editor of the folio alters by independent conjecture, where he could have obtained the true reading from an earlier edition. One example however is Aug. 18, where the reading of the fifth quarto 'may plaine' is mended into 'my plaint' instead of 'my payne' as given in the first two quartos. In several instances where all the quartos are wrong the conjectures of the folio editor (if they be conjectures only) are excellent, e.g. March 4 'nigheth,' June 16 'shroud,' Aug. 84 'thy,' Sept. 145 'yead,' Nov. 78 'made you,' which last surely ought to be accepted into the text.

In connexion with these corrections we may be disposed to attribute some original authority to the folio, such as the 1609 edition of the *Faerie Queene* possessed (at least so far as regards the added cantos), and if this be so, we may be inclined to regard some other alterations as authoritative, for example those in the *Ruines of Time*, 447—455.

Professor de Sélincourt's review of the editions of Spenser 'from 1617—1884' is interesting and judicial. He should have entitled it 'On the Text of Spenser from 1617—1908,' for he includes, rather at the last moment, the edition by Professor Neil Dodge (reviewed in the *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, July 1909). It is fortunate perhaps that his attention was called to this before publication, because some surprise was felt on

[1] This change, however, is put down by the editor in the Introduction (p. xvi) to the credit of the folio, and the reader has no means of knowing whether the statement of the critical footnote or that of the Introduction is correct. As a matter of fact the footnote is right in this instance.

the other side of the water that no mention should have been made of this in Mr J. C. Smith's edition of the *Faerie Queene*, and it is sometimes felt with justice that the excellent work done by Americans in English literature is not so speedily recognised in this country as it should be.

The value of a book like this depends of course mainly upon the accuracy of the collations, and it is therefore the reviewer's duty to test this to some extent. Professor de Sélincourt, who is humane in his remarks upon the mistakes of earlier editors, will not be surprised probably to learn that his own work has some errors. In fact there are rather too many; and it is a pity that some of them were not removed by a more careful revision. The present reviewer has had before him the folio of 1611, the third quarto (1586) of the *Shepheardes Calender*, and the quarto (1590) of *Muiopotmos*, and he has roughly collated the text of the last-named poem and of the eclogues for January, March, April, September, October, November, December in the *Shepheardes Calender*. The following are places where errors have been found in Professor de Sélincourt's text or notes:

Shepheardes Calender, April, l. 8. The text has 'thriftye' without note of variation. This is no doubt a misprint for 'thristye,' the reading of the first quarto. It is 'thirstie' in Q_3 and *F*. 31 gaze Q_3. 148 his way *F*. September, l. 25 woe Q_3 *F*. (This is also the reading of Q_4.) 54 blast Q_3 (*also* Q_4). 64 diddest Q_3 *F*. 195 wide *om. F*. 218 mans *F*. October, l. 80 not *F*. November, l. 28 foolerie? *F*. 49 chose Q_3 *F* (this ought to be noted, I think). 115 coloured Q_3 *F* (the editor's footnote here is inconsistent with his note on p. 514). 197 God *F*. December, l. 19, youthfull spring *F*.

Muiopotmos, l. 54 lustiehed *F*. 412 tunes *Q F* (the reading 'runes' in the text must of course be a misprint, and it is a very bad one). 431 yonthly *F*. Probably the true reading is 'yongthly.' It may be noted here that the readings of the Camb. Univ. quarto of *Muiopotmos* in ll. 250, 354, 370 agree with those of the Huth copy.

A few further points which suggest remark may be taken as they come in the book.

Introduction, p. xvi. The statements about the text of *Sh. Cal.* May 186, and of the October Gloss, are inconsistent with those of the critical footnotes.

Ib., pp. xxii, xxiv. We feel in private duty bound to observe upon the inaccurate forms of reference used by the editor with regard to this Review. He calls it first the *Modern Languages Quarterly* and then the *Modern Languages Review*. Neither title is correct.

p. 160. *Teares of the Muses*, l. 232. I suspect that 'singulfs' is what Spenser wrote here, and in the three other places where the word occurs, *Colin Clout*, l. 168, *Faerie Queene*, III. xi. 12, and v. vi. 13. Surely there cannot be a printer's error in every case. After all 'singulf' is in itself a more satisfactory word than 'singult,' though etymologically incorrect, and the changes produce a very inharmonious effect.

p. 202, *Mother Hubberds Tale*, l. 185. The alteration in the folio was probably not made to avoid the dissyllabic pronunciation of 'worlds,'

but on account of the irregular metre of the first half of the line, which surely needs some amendment.

p. 229, *M.H.T.*, l. 1231. The excellent emendation 'The' for 'And' (due to Mr J. C. Smith) makes sense of a passage which has hitherto been nonsense, and may be regarded as certain.

p. 285, *Visions of Petrarch*, l. 85. Why is not Morris's correction 'behold,' which the editor regards as 'obviously right,' admitted into the text?

p. 507. There are several 'faults escaped in the print' on this page: the reference '*Dec.* 7' should be '*Dec.* 76'; that for 'thinken,' two lines lower, is missing (perhaps *Feb.* 41), and the next, to '*Ap.* 14,' is in some way wrong.

p. 518. Note on *Mother Hubberds Tale*, l. 913. The explanation of 'himselfe will a daw trie,' given on the authority of Mr Walter Worrall, is certainly right, and it is not very difficult to see how 'trie' got this meaning from the original sense, 'separate,' 'mark off' (good from bad): 'he will mark himself off as a pretentious fool.'

ib. Note on l. 1204. Professor de Sélincourt knows, of course, that 'vail' is simply a modern form of 'avail,' which meant 'advantage,' hence 'gift,' 'bribe'; so that it is surely superfluous to mention the conjecture 'a vaile' here.

ib. Note on *Ruines of Rome*, l. 119. The editor seems to agree with Morris that some such rhyme as 'failed' is required here. As a matter of fact the rhyme should be with '-ed' (of 'traueiled'), and the last syllable of 'palaces' supplies an assonance with which Spenser was apparently satisfied.

p. 521. Note on *Amoretti*, xxvi. 4. Mr Greg's suggestion is right enough as regards the meaning, but there is no misprint: 'firbloome' is quite an admissible form. See *N.E.D.* under 'fur' and 'furze.'

The volume is a fine specimen of typography, beautiful to look at and delightful to read. It has facsimile reproductions of the title-pages of the original editions, and contains not only the woodcuts of the *Shepheardes Calender*, which have been made tolerably familiar by Dr Sommer's reprint of the first quarto, but also the very interesting pictures attached to the translations from Petrarch and du Bellay in Van der Noodt's *Theatre for Worldlings* (1569). We must congratulate both Professor de Sélincourt and the Clarendon Press on the result of their joint labours.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

The Poems of John Dryden. Edited with an Introduction and Textual Notes by John Sargeaunt (Oxford edition). London: Frowde. 1910. 8vo. xxiii + 606 pp.

Mr Sargeaunt is the first editor of Dryden who has given a reprint of his poems (omitting the dramas and the translation of Virgil) in the spelling and capitals of the original editions, and he has restored the

correct text in numberless instances. By so doing he has deserved well of students of English literature. One may question, to be sure, whether the retaining of the original spelling in a cheap edition, designed for circulation among the unlearned, is likely to increase the number of admirers of Dryden; in such a volume literal fidelity to the orthography of seventeenth-century compositors is a question of policy, not of scholarship. Furthermore, if an editor wishes to give as an introduction to a popular edition fifteen pages of criticism of his predecessors, rather than some account of the life and genius of Dryden, or, if that would be out of place in a text edition, some description of the original editions of the different poems; and if he prefers to devote the small space available for notes to pointing out sedulously all the places in which his predecessors have strayed from the path of textual accuracy, rather than to explaining briefly passages that without comment are wholly unintelligible to modern readers,—if an editor prefers such a course, one may marvel at his taste, but one cannot therefore denounce him as incompetent. But when Mr Sargeaunt passes from criticism to vituperation (see in particular p. xxii of his Introduction), one is impelled to look rather searchingly at his book, to see whether he himself may not be liable to some of the reproaches that he showers so plentifully on his fellow-students of Dryden.

An editor of Dryden should know first of all what editions of each poem were published during the author's lifetime; he should determine which text is to be regarded as Dryden's final revision, and should adopt that text as the basis of his own reprint. In his notes he should give accurate bibliographical information as to each of the other texts. If he gives variant readings from texts other than those adopted as the basis of his own edition, he should do his work thoroughly, citing all variants except insignificant variations in spelling, capitals, and punctuation.

Mr Sargeaunt's treatment of the very first piece in his volume, *A Poem upon the Death of his late Highness, Oliver, Lord Protector of England, Scotland, and Ireland,* is an indication of his shortcomings in the first requirement of a text editor. Two editions of this poem were published in 1659, one by itself, the other with poems by Waller and Sprat, in a volume entitled *Three Poems upon the Death of his late Highnesse Oliver,* etc. Mr Sargeaunt apparently has not seen the *Three Poems* text, to which he makes no reference, though it is mentioned both by Christie and by Professor Saintsbury, of whose editorial work he speaks so contemptuously in his Introduction. In stanza 14, line 4, he corrects 'are sown' of the '1659' text into 'is sown.' The correction is just; it is found in the *Three Poems* text of 1659.

On *The Second Part of Absalom and Achitophel,* despite its mixed authorship, an editor of Dryden might be expected to bestow reasonable care. The first and second editions of this poem were published in 1682, the third in 1716, in the *Second Part of Miscellany Poems.* 'Will it be believed that the English editor,' to quote Mr Sargeaunt's own indignant rhetoric in his Introduction (p. xiii), overlooks the real

second edition, which he should have taken as the basis of his text, and calls the third edition the second, in the face of a plain statement in the edition itself? He does so, and on line 33 he remarks 'since] *The editors give* as,' which is the reading of the second and third editions.

Dryden's epistle *To the Earl of Roscomon* was printed with that nobleman's *Essay on Translated Verse*, which was first published in 1684, but which appeared in a second edition in 1685. Between the two editions Dryden, besides correcting a misprint in his poem (line 47), made two changes in it (lines 60 and 72). Of course the second edition is that which should be followed, but of its existence Mr Sargeaunt is apparently ignorant. Thus in line 60 he reads 'a *Brittish*' (as in ed. 1) and remarks, '*Some editions wrongly give* an English,' which is Dryden's own corrected version. But in line 72 he gives 'Who both' (as in ed. 2) instead of 'He both' (as in ed. 1). This last, from Mr Sargeaunt's point of view, is an error of detail; Mr Sargeaunt presumably used as the basis of his collation a text that had the reading of the second edition and simply neglected to make the correction from the first edition: he gives no note on the line.

The poet's epistle *To my Honour'd Friend Dr Charleton* was similarly published with Charleton's *Chorea Gigantum*, 1663. Of that book there were two issues, which may be distinguished by the presence or absence of the censor's imprimatur, dated '11 Sept. 1662.' Dryden's poem as printed in the two issues shows variations of text in lines 13, 22, 50, 52, and 55. Mr Sargeaunt gives the text of the copy without the imprimatur, and is apparently ignorant of the existence of the other: Scott's note on line 50 should have made him suspect the true state of the case. The poem was reprinted by Tonson in 1704 (in *Poetical Miscellanies, the Fifth Part*), with variant readings in lines 7, 22, and 54, the first of which Mr Sargeaunt omits.

Mr Sargeaunt's disregard of the fairly well-known fact that varying issues exist of the same edition of several poems by Dryden is the more surprising since he refers to the matter in his Introduction. 'These restorations of the text,' he writes (p. xv), referring to some of his own work, 'are such as Dryden's editors might with reasonable industry have succeeded in making. There is, however, one problem of which they never suspected the existence. My friend, Mr Henry B. Wheatley, discovered that what profess to be copies of the first edition of *Absalom and Achitophel* differ from one another.' Mr Wheatley's discovery was long ago anticipated; see a note in the Aldine Dryden (London, Bell, 1891), which states that in line 179 of *Absalom and Achitophel* at least one copy of the first edition reads 'patriot's' instead of 'patron's.' This note presumably goes back to the original Aldine edition of 1832–33, to which I am at present unable to refer; at all events it is found in the American reprint of that edition (Boston, 1864). In my own Cambridge edition (Boston, 1908), I ought to have reproduced this note, and I ought to have searched further than the copy of the first edition owned by the Harvard Library, which I used for my own collation. Mr Sargeaunt, though he apparently had the varying issues

directly under his hand, followed a similarly slothful course. Just below he loftily remarks: 'It is obviously impossible to collate all existing copies.' The case is not so bad as that; in only two instances (*The Medal* and possibly *Annus Mirabilis*) have I found reason to believe that there were more than two differing issues of the same edition.

Mr Wheatley's 'discovery' led Mr Sargeaunt to remark that there were two different issues of the first edition (1667) of *Annus Mirabilis*. He had them both at hand, and cites a most interesting variant reading in stanza 105. I had suspected the existence of the two issues from the fact that a reading quoted by Christie for stanza 67, line 3, was not found in the Harvard Library copy. I made inquiries of the British Museum, the Yale Library, and one private collector, but was not fortunate enough to find a copy of the other issue. Mr Sargeaunt fails to record any variation of text between his two 1667 issues for stanza 67, line 3; perhaps there were really three issues of the first edition, and the two used by him agree on this line.

Mr Sargeaunt derives his text of *The Medal* 'from the second edition, 1683.' This statement seems not quite accurate; the second edition was published in *Miscellany Poems*, 1684, though it has a separate title-page, dated 1683. In the *Epistle to the Whigs* the second edition has a clear misprint, 'same cases' instead of 'some cases,' which Mr Sargeaunt duly reproduces (page 83, line 14); all issues of the first edition (1682), and the third edition (1692) read 'some cases.' Below (page 83, line 48) the second and third editions read 'are printed' (instead of 'is printed'), but this time Mr Sargeaunt, presumably by an error of collation, gives the text of the first edition. In my Cambridge Dryden I note that there are two issues of the first edition, distinguished by the presence or absence of the Latin motto at the close of the poem, and I cite some important variations between them in lines 174 and 179–182. Since my collation was completed the University of California Library has received a copy of the first edition that contains the motto but agrees in these lines with the text of the Harvard copy without the motto. I conclude that there are three issues of this first edition.

Mr Sargeaunt's indications of the sources of his own texts are not always satisfactory. Thus on *A Letter to Sir George Etherege* he has the note, 'Text from the *Miscellanies* of several dates'! The piece was first printed, so far as I have been able to discover, in the third edition of *Sylvae* (1702). His text of the prologue to *The Prophetess* would seem, according to his note, to be derived from a copy of the play printed in 1690. I have been unable to find that this prologue was printed before the year 1708, in the second edition of *The Annual Miscellany for the Year 1694*. The prologue, as spoken, gave offence by its political references, and was consequently suppressed; perhaps some copies of *The Prophetess* were printed containing it and Mr Sargeaunt has been fortunate enough to see one of them. Conversely, he states that the prologue and epilogue to *Cleomenes* were not printed with

the first edition of the play. They are found in the copy owned by the Harvard Library. On the prologue to *The Unhappy Favourite* Mr Sargeaunt writes the note: 'Printed in the *Miscellanies* of 1684 and with the play, which is by Banks, in 1685.' This piece appeared in the first edition of the play, dated 1682, but printed, as Mr Sargeaunt might have learned from Professor Arber's reprint of the *Term Catalogues*, near the close of 1681. On *A Song for St Cecilia's Day, November* 22, 1687, Mr Sargeaunt gives a note that is important, if true: 'Text from the original of 1687.' This ode, like its greater successor, *Alexander's Feast*, was probably originally printed as a broadside at the time that it was sung in public, but I have been unable to find any mention of a surviving copy of that broadside, other than the hint in Mr Sargeaunt's note. Mr Sargeaunt, if he has had better luck, might well have been more explicit in his statement. On Dryden's verses *Upon the Death of the Viscount of Dundee* Mr Sargeaunt gives the somewhat cryptic statement: 'Text of 1704.' Two texts of this epigram were printed in 1704, one in *Poetical Miscellanies, the Fifth Part*, and the other in *Poems on Affairs of State*, vol. iii. Mr Sargeaunt apparently follows the former text, but in the title he corrects 'Earl' into 'Viscount,' and in line 7 substitutes 'living didst' (of *Poems on Affairs of State*) for 'dying did' (of the *Miscellanies*), probably by an error of collation, since he gives no note on the line. The epitaph *On the Monument of the Marquis of Winchester* Mr Sargeaunt says that he prints from 'Pope's *Miscellanies*, 1712.' But here he neglects the capitals of the original text, which he ordinarily sedulously preserves, and in the first line gives 'untainted' (the reading on the monument itself) instead of 'undaunted' (the reading in the *Miscellanies*), with no note upon the change of text.

Several of Dryden's early prologues, epilogues, and songs were printed in contemporary miscellanies, presumably without his sanction, with texts that, though they may preserve some variant readings that actually came from Dryden, can hardly be regarded as approved by him. The duty of an editor towards these miscellanies is hard to define; he may entirely disregard them, he may mention that they contain certain pieces by Dryden, without bothering to give a complete collation of the texts found in them, or he may conscientiously give in his notes all the information to be derived from them. Mr Sargeaunt shuffles between the first and third courses in a fashion that cannot be commended. There are four such miscellanies known to me, with apparently equal claims to attention or neglect: *Westminster Drollery; or, A Choice Collection of the Newest Songs and Poems*, 1671; *Westminster Drollery, the Second Part*, 1672; *New Court Songs and Poems, by R. V., Gent.*, 1672; and *Covent Garden Drollery*, 1672. (Of this last miscellany there are two issues, said to be 'collected' by 'A. B.' and by 'R. B.' respectively. I have been unable to consult the former, but have found no evidence that the text of Dryden's pieces varies in the two issues.) Of these four Mr Sargeaunt is apparently acquainted only with *Covent Garden Drollery*, though Christie long ago called attention

(Globe Dryden, p. 367) to *New Court Songs and Poems*, which contains the songs from *Marriage à la Mode*, and (*ibid.*, p. 411) to *Westminster Drollery* [*the Second Part*], which contains the *Prologue spoken on the First Day of the King's House acting after the Fire* and one song from *Marriage à la Mode*. From *Covent Garden Drollery* Mr Sargeaunt gives an incomplete list of variants for the prologue to *Albumazar*, *Prologue spoken on the First Day of the King's House acting after the Fire*, and the prologue to *Marriage à la Mode*; for the epilogue to *Marriage à la Mode* he gives no variants at all.

In his book Mr Sargeaunt frequently shows much more zeal in calling attention to the errors of previous editors (which, once corrected, become of no importance to anybody) than to noting variations of text that are due, or may be due, to Dryden himself. The most glaring instance of this is in *Mac Flecknoe*. As is well known, Dryden thoroughly revised this poem between the appearance of the first edition (1682) and that of the second (in *Miscellany Poems*, 1684); the chief variants were noted by Malone in the year 1800 (*Prose Works of John Dryden*, vol. i, pp. 170–172). Mr Sargeaunt gives only seven out of the multitude. Of those seven he regards one as of sufficient importance to write a whole paragraph about it in his Introduction (pp. xxii, xxiii). Here he gives the reading of line 185 in the first edition as:

> But so transfus'd as Oyls on Waters flow.

It is really, in the two copies of the first edition accessible to me (owned by private collectors in New York):

> But so transfus'd as Oyls on Water Flow.

Unless there were two issues of this first edition, the variation is not of much importance except as a measure of Mr Sargeaunt's scholarly accuracy. But the capital letter on 'Flow' may give some support to the opinion expressed in my edition that this word should be taken as a noun rather than a verb, 'Water' being a misprint for 'Water's' or 'Waters' (the reading of the second edition). Mr Sargeaunt's interpretation and reading of the passage, however, may be correct, even though his citation of the first edition be faulty.

In this review of a book that, despite real merits, absolutely invites attack owing to its arrogant tone, I have not exhausted the material for censure derived from my examination of it. I may have said enough, however, to add point to Mr Sargeaunt's pungent statement in his Introduction (p. xi): 'Some evil spirit seems to have dogged the steps of Dryden's editors, and may well raise apprehension in one who ventures to add himself to their number.'

It is plain that for students of English letters a full and accurate bibliography of Dryden is greatly to be desired. Such a bibliography would not be easy to prepare, since, so far as I know, no collection of the contemporary editions of the poet's writings even approaches completeness. A still greater desideratum is a critical edition of Dryden's

complete works, in the spelling of the originals, and with the variant readings duly recorded. Such an edition could hardly be commercially profitable, and could probably best be undertaken by one of the great universities of England or America. The editorial labour would have to be intrusted to more than one person, for no single man could be expected to submit to the wearisome, cheerless, and almost endless drudgery that would be involved in the preparation of a really definitive edition.

George R. Noyes.

Berkeley, California, U.S.A.

A Short History of English Versification. By Max Kaluza. Translated by A. C. Dunstan. London: George Allen. 1911. 8vo. xv + 396 pp.

English prosody is a study which theorists have done so much to obscure that the ordinary student is apt to abandon it in despair after attempting to reconcile conflicting views and to find a foundation for baseless fabrics. As generally happens where the amateur has not yet retired before the scientific enquirer, much of the confusion arises from a want of agreement as to the meaning of the terms used, much also from the want of a thoroughgoing analysis. While English and American prosodists have been evolving theories of modern English versification, German investigators have begun at the beginning and sought to establish the principles underlying Old English and Middle English versification. It is true that entire unanimity has not yet been reached as to these principles, but at any rate the essential facts are secure.

In treating of modern English prosody the native might be expected to possess a great advantage over the foreigner, but this has not always been the case, judging by results. The English metrist is too apt to base his theories upon his own reading of English verse; his treatment tends to be subjective and therefore unscientific. Strictly speaking, we should have to know how the poet reads his own verses, but this knowledge has hitherto been unattainable, as no one has thought of making an exact, i.e. phonetic, transcription of the poet's delivery, nor has the poet thought of providing phonographic records for the prosodists. Until this be done, we can hardly expect to be able to understand fully the poet's versification. This of course has nothing to do with individual preferences by readers, of which our poet knows and cares nothing. The musical composer and the executants who 'interpret' his works are not always of one mind. In Professor Kaluza's manual we find a detailed presentment and discussion of the facts and theories of Old English and Middle English versification, followed by a slighter and chiefly descriptive treatment of modern English verse-forms. In the preface to the German edition (1909), Professor Kaluza says he has no thought of rivalry with Schipper's well-known larger treatise or with

his *Grundriss*. He hopes there is room for another book suitable for less advanced students; moreover he considers Schipper's treatment of O.E. and M.E. prosody *verbesserungsbedürftig*. In Kaluza's book about two-thirds of the whole space is allotted to the O.E. and M.E. periods. His excuse for so full a treatment is that authorities are still not agreed, and after setting forth and criticising the views of various scholars such as Möller, Sievers, Trautmann, Schipper, etc. he himself suggests a compromise between the 'two-beat' and the 'four-beat' theories based on a division of the half-line into four 'members' (glieder). The result of his analysis is ninety subspecies for O.E. verse, under which every half-line must surely range itself without a murmur. Kaluza accepts Sievers' well-known analysis and types with certain modifications of his own. The question of the mode of delivery (recitation, singing) he does not discuss. The explanation of vowel-alliteration, which he accepts without question, namely the assumption of the existence of the glottal stop, is alluringly simple, but he should have mentioned that this theory does not commend itself to all scholars. Nor is any mention made of Sievers' denial of the existence of strophic structure in O.E. verse. Kaluza's objection (pp. 30, 31) to the two-beat theory of O.E. versification, based on the usage of Otfrid and Laȝamon, takes it for granted that the metrical stress of O.E. verse was preserved unaltered right up to the middle of the twelfth century. Thus on p. 31 he says 'If, therefore, Otfrid and Laȝamon could use these inflexional and derivative syllables as full beats, then they must be assumed as full beats for the much earlier alliterative verse.' Further, on p. 138, he says 'Whoever, therefore, finds four beats in Laȝamon, must also find four in O.E. verse.' In this connexion we must notice that Kaluza, like some other scholars, is of opinion that the O.E. alliterative long line 'decayed.' 'The strict laws,' he says (p. 128), 'which had regulated its structure in the O.E. period were no longer observed with the same care' (i.e. in Early M.E.). It is well here to bear in mind that the language of the early M.E. poems such as the *Brut* is the popular speech or at least the ordinary speech of the literate Englishmen of the time so far as its case endings and stress is concerned. The rules of O.E. versification were intended for, and only applicable to, the O.E. literary poetic language; when on the disappearance of Anglo-Saxon culture this language ceased to be used, the rules of its prosody would also lose their *raison d'être* and be forgotten. Just as we assume that in O.E. times there must have existed a popular speech differing considerably in vocabulary, structure and pronunciation from the literary speech, which popular speech at last attained to recognition and employment as a literary vehicle in early M.E., may we not also assume the existence in O.E. of a popular form of versification orally transmitted, differing from the literary form and surviving it? Such an assumption is in accordance with what is observable in later English literature, as well as in the literatures of other countries. It was natural therefore that the early M.E. poet should use the versification which he heard round him in unwritten song and story, and not at all natural that he should seek to

adapt an archaic form of versification quite unsuitable to his material, even if he were acquainted with it. Mention might have been made of the verses contained in the later part of the Saxon Chronicle, which show a strong resemblance to the *Brut* in their versification. In his Introduction Kaluza remarks 'By the side of the purely descriptive and the historical treatment of English prosody there must be an aesthetic-critical examination of the individual verses and stanzas. A judgment of their beauty and their fitness, both in general and with reference to the particular aims of the poet, must be arrived at.' The hopes aroused by this statement are hardly fulfilled in the part of the book devoted to Modern English prosody. Here Kaluza depends a great deal on the writings of English prosodists, whom he frequently quotes without offering any criticism of his own. A few points only may be noticed. On p. 271 he says 'The attempts to write English quantitative verse, especially the quantitative hexameter, met with no success, because the differences in quantity in N.E. (Mod. English) are not so marked as in Latin and Greek, and the word-accent and sentence-accent in N.E. cannot give way to the verse-accent as in Latin and Greek.' The want of success would seem to be due rather to the failure of poets to discriminate accurately the quantity of syllables in English, than to the actual absence of marked difference in quantity. Greek and Latin poets were trained at school to distinguish quantity; even we moderns have our *Gradus ad Parnassum* as a guide in cases of doubt, when we are writing Latin verses. The English versifier has no such training, and in the absence of an authoritative guide he has to trust to his ear, which often leads him astray. Is it any wonder then if he has 'met with no success'? Some English poets, however, have succeeded in writing perfect or nearly perfect hexameters on the classical model, and any trained phonetician could produce technically correct lines. As regards Kaluza's statement that 'the word-accent and the sentence-accent in N.E. cannot give way to the verse-accent,' this is disproved by countless instances. Take for example Byron's line 'And he saw the lean dogs beneath the wall,' quoted by Kaluza on p. 300. A strong sentence-stress falls on 'lean,' but the verse-scheme requires it to be weakly stressed. Many persons, perhaps some poets also, 'scan' the lines as they read, i.e. emphasize the metrical stress at the expense of the normal stress. Being so familiar in English verse with the scheme $\times\,'\,\times\,'\,\times\,'$ etc. they fit the words into it, half unconsciously perhaps; consequently all sorts of abnormal stresses occur and excite no remark. In the case of English hexameters, the reader who knows no Greek or Latin finds no rhythm at all as he reads them with normal pronunciation, while the English classical scholar, familiar with the metre which he reads in his own and often incorrect way (heavily stressing every long syllable at the beginning of a foot) applies his method of reading to English imitations and finds that all sorts of unnatural stresses occur. Again no success. The subject of quantity (p. 277) is dismissed in a few lines. 'Quantity,' we are told, 'is also of some importance for English prosody.' Now nothing is more striking

about the versification of such a careful artist as Tennyson than the important part played by the quantity of syllables in obtaining subtle sound-effects. A fuller treatment might have been expected from Professor Kaluza of this interesting part of the subject.

While it may be thought that an undue amount of attention has been devoted to the earlier versification, and not enough to the modern period, the fact remains that Professor Kaluza's book contains much of value, and in its English dress will, we hope, lead younger students to undertake investigations on sound principles in English metrics.

The translation is on the whole adequate. On p. 48 l. 2 'settled' (beseitigt) should be 'disposed of'; on p. 272 l. 2 'interchange' should be 'alternation' (abwechslung). The first sentence of § 222 is so condensed as to be misleading. Such terms as 'hovering accent' and 'gliding ending' do not altogether recommend themselves.

W. J. Sedgefield.

Manchester.

Sidelights on Teutonic History during the Migration Period. By M. G. Clarke. (Girton College Studies No. III.) Cambridge: University Press. 1911. 8vo. xiv + 263 pp.

Under this somewhat cumbersome title Miss M. G. Clarke presents us with an interesting and valuable study of the historical elements which may be discovered in the Old English heroic poems. During the greater part of the nineteenth century English and continental scholarship occupied itself almost entirely with the textual study of these poems or with their interpretation in terms of myth and allegory, and it is only during the last twenty-five or thirty years that the very important question of their historical truth has been a matter of investigation. Already much valuable work has been done by Mr Chadwick in his work on the *Origin of the English Nation* and by Dr Axel Olrik in his studies of Danish heroic poetry, to mention two only of the pioneers, and Miss Clarke now summarises the results attained, makes independent and judicious criticisms of her own, and adds a good deal of material which she has discovered or worked out for herself.

The work includes a full discussion of the references to the Danes, the Swedes and the Götar, and an account of the Offa, Finn, Hilde, Weland, Walthari and Ermanric sagas, so far as allusion is made to them in Old English poetry. In each chapter we have a summary view of the O.E. references, then a conspectus of the evidence from other sources, followed by a comparative view of the two, concluding with a summary of inferences as to the historical truth which may with justice be deduced from the allusions in the poems. The evidence is often so scanty that it is difficult to come to decisions of assured finality, but the author is in no hurry to draw definite conclusions and is rarely a prey to pure theorising. In the discussion of the Ingeld-Froda episode in *Beowulf* and of the figures of Dan and Fróði in the line of Danish

kings, it is to be regretted that Miss Clarke does not seem to have been able to consult the second volume of Dr Olrik's *Danmarks Heltedigtning*, with its full discussion of the Starkad story and of the later Skjǫldung kings.

The book is an invaluable storehouse of reference and quotation which must make it a handbook for every student who wishes to make a thorough study of O.E. heroic poetry, and considering the mass of reference and quotation it is as a whole remarkably free from error. We may, however, point out two slips, one somewhat serious, in the references. On p. 111 the reference for the long rule of Hrothgar and Hrothwulf should be to *Widsith*, ll. 45 ff., and not to *Beowulf*, ll. 1163 ff., while the quotation from *Waldere* on p. 190 has no reference at all to the Hilde saga. The translations are at times slipshod and inaccurate. 'Ðæs ofereode, þisses swa mæg' is not satisfactorily rendered by 'That came to an end, this may likewise' (p. 7) or 'wæs sio hond to strong se þe meca gehwane mine gefræge swenge ofersohte' by 'too strong was the hand which, as I have heard, surpassed every sword in its stroke,' and the translations from the Latin chroniclers on pp. 43 and 44 are equally at fault. These inaccuracies make it the more to be regretted that in many cases the original is not quoted. This is almost uniformly the case in the passages quoted from Old Norse, which are given only in translation. In a book which must always be read by scholars rather than by the general reader it would have been well to quote the original in every case where a full translation is given. Space might well have been found for this by sacrificing the somewhat superfluous sketch of Old Norse Literature on pp. 13–24. There are numerous small slips in spelling and expression, and one cannot but condemn the publication of a book of this character without an index. Amid the mass of detail it is almost impossible rapidly to find the exact reference to a particular person or poem which one may require; and this detracts very seriously from the usefulness of the book. Criticisms of detail must not however blind us to its great value and interest as a whole, and the writer only makes them in the hope that a second edition may be called for ere long and the author be able to remove these blots.

Allen Mawer.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

The Spirit of Romance. An Attempt to define somewhat the Charm of the pre-Renaissance Literature of Latin Europe. By Ezra Pound. London: J. M. Dent. n.d. 8vo. x + 251 pp.

Mr Ezra Pound is right in his admiration of poetry, and in the claim which he makes on behalf of the troubadours and others that they should be valued as living authors. Some of his attention is given to Dante, and in his later studies he comes down beyond the Middle Ages, to Camoens and Lope de Vega, poets not without honour; but the chief part of his work is concerned with poets less generally known,

with Arnaut Daniel and Guido Guinicelli and others in Provence and Italy. His argument is that those earlier composers are not to be treated as mere curiosities or literary antiquities. He is not the first to whom they have seemed beautiful, but their old poetry is not so well known as to make his generous advocacy superfluous. His book ought to be an encouragement to many young people to undertake some explorations, and make discoveries for themselves, especially among the lyric poets who were the masters of Dante. Generally speaking Mr Pound (like many other critics) is happier in his admiration than his censure. He ought not to speak disrespectfully of philology. He has escaped from it, he says, in order to follow pure poetry. There seems to be a fallacy in this, and a misconception of the nature of pure poetry. It is true that the enjoyment of poetry is a different thing from a philological demonstration, but the study of poetry, if it is to be anything but monotonous praise, is bound to be technical and analytic. The student of pure music or architecture does not boast of escaping from the scientific foundations of his art. One might appeal to Dante, whose analysis of his own poems is as strict as Euclid, and whose treatise *De Vulgari Eloquentia* is (for the most part) pure and dry philology. There is also the example of Jacob Grimm. The Preface to the *Deutsche Grammatik* shows more toleration and more comprehension than Mr Pound. Grimm's immediate motive for his linguistic work was his interest in the poetry of Walther and Wolfram, and he is not ashamed as many philologists would be to speak of poetry in his preface; nor, on the other hand, is he troubled as Mr Pound appears to be, by any fear lest philology should hinder his appreciation of the poets.

Mr Pound has not paid quite enough attention to small things; some dead flies have escaped his notice. There is a grating misquotation of the most beautiful of all Provençal lyrics, the poem of Bernart de Ventadour which begins with the song of the lark, in a passage which Dante could not outdo. Some of the minor conventions are neglected; why should 'Dr W. P. Ker' be treated with outward respect (even though his conclusions are rejected) when 'Paget Toynbee' is spoken of without ceremony (though on the whole with approbation)? Miss Farnell's translation of the *Lives* of the Troubadours has never yet had all the gratitude it deserves; Mr Pound speaks of her, abruptly, as 'Farnell'; otherwise he does no injustice to her admirable book. The great fault of Mr Pound's work is that it shows too little consideration for the readers who know nothing, but who are prepared to learn. The readers who know as much as Mr Pound about these poets are few in number; those who know less will have great difficulty in making out the meaning of his arguments. No doubt, it is one of the hardest problems in historical writing: how to make an intelligible story about a literature wholly unfamiliar and foreign. The thing can be done; Mr Nicholson's *Literary History of the Arabs* is a fascinating book for many readers who know nothing of Arabic and who were previously little interested in the subject. It is not everyone who can perform a feat of skill like this; Mr Pound has certainly not come near to equal it.

Those who wish for a clear statement of the aims and the several kinds of Provençal poetry will find nothing here to compare with the three papers by M. Jeanroy, published a few years ago in the *Revue des deux mondes*.

If many of Mr Pound's opinions seem debatable, that is no more than may be said of the greatest critics. Is not his estimate of Camoens rather too low, and unjust to the lyrical poetry? Coming back to the earlier poets, we might ask whether the Count of Poitiers—'William Earl of Poiton'—did not deserve more attention than is given him. 'The Spirit of Romance' is in his rhymes; more particularly, his poems are interesting for their mediation between popular and 'courtly' forms; for their ribaldry, their pathos, both equally genuine and characteristic; for their mastery of the shorter forms of verse, unlike the statelier and slower measures which have the heroic line as their base. Prosody ought to have been used more freely in explaining the character of the early lyric poets; it is repulsive to many students, but those who are engaged in the history of poetry cannot afford to do without it. The patterns of verse can be described in such a way as to explain many poetical things outside of prosody. In the earlier lyric poetry of the Romance languages—French, Provençal and Italian—(not to speak of the lyrics of the Minnesingers) there are frequent anticipations of later forms: not only of stanzas (such as the *rhyme royal*) but of phrasing and poetical syntax. There are many Provençal poets who are Elizabethan in their poetical language—in verse, in ideas, and in the way their ideas are disposed. It might be interesting to consider in what respects the following passage differs from the manner of the Elizabethan sonneteers—say Drayton or Daniel:

> Amors et ieu em de tal guiza pres
> Qu'ora ni jorn, nueg ni mati ni ser
> No s part de me, ni eu de bon esper
> E mort m'agra la dolors, tan grans es,
> S'en bon esper no m fos asseguratz.

A survey which goes from the earliest Provençal to Camoens and Lope de Vega, and which is not checked by the most difficult and subtle passages, might have brought out more clearly the relation of the different schools or orders to one another; of Petrarch to the Provençal authors, of Camoens to Petrarch. The title of the book implies that there is a real community of poets, that they have ideas in common, that thoughts and melodies are translated from one age and one language to another. The history of 'courtly makers' from William of Poitiers to Cowley might be a tedious thing, and much of it would be a record of vanities; but it is not impossible. It requires a fine understanding of poetry such as is displayed throughout this book; it requires also a less enthusiastic style, a more deliberate and more prosaic method; the example of Dante is not to be despised; he did not think it expedient to be poetical in style when he was writing as an analyst of poetry.

W. P. Ker.

London.

A Century of French Poets. Edited by Francis Yvon Eccles. London: Constable. 1909. 8vo. ix + 399 pp.

This Chrestomathy is disappointing. Mr Eccles states his purpose thus: 'My plan was to cull among the works of some forty poets—not necessarily all the best, but each representing a phase in the later poetical development of France—such examples as should convey a just notion of their peculiar qualities and of their range. For this reason I have found no place for some better poets than Millevoye, Delavigne, Laprade and even Sully-Prudhomme; and I have passed by many reputed masterpieces; not of course as soaring above the ordinary level of their authors, but because they did not appear to illustrate an authentic manner or to furnish a contributory type.' The idea was an excellent one. Such an Anthology, not of purple passages, but of illustrative poems, has long been a desideratum, for Walch's overfilled volumes cannot be said to have supplied it. But the task was a difficult one, and, while I am unwilling to appear over-critical, I do not think it can be said that Mr Eccles has succeeded in carrying out his own plan. Why are Stuart Merrill and Frances Jammes omitted? Both certainly represent phases in the later poetical development of France, phases which are represented by no poet in Mr Eccles' selection. Why are Rimbaud and Tristan Corbière unsampled? Why is Millevoye inserted and Chênedollé, a far more important forerunner of Romanticism, left out? And this is not all. Poets included in the Chrestomathy are, in many cases, not represented by really typical and illustrative examples. Take Leconte de Lisle, for example. Where are illustrations of his evocations of the barbaric past of Europe and Asia, of his 'ferocious hostility to the faith of his fathers, which...disfigures his presentment of the middle ages'? (Is Mr Belloc's advice responsible for this omission of a very characteristic aspect of Leconte de Lisle's work?) Or of the nostalgia that inspired many a fine poem breathing the love of his native island and calling up the vision of his first love? Where, indeed, are examples of any of those love poems that prove so conclusively that he was not *impassible*? The selection from Leconte de Lisle, save for the inclusion of *Le Sacre de Paris*, is less than conventional, it is quite unsatisfactory. Take Laforgue again. There are no examples of his alexandrines or of his *vers libres*. This is an unfortunate omission in the case of a poet whose versification stands at so important a dividing of the ways. Space ought certainly to have been found for, say, *L'Hiver qui vient* and *Complainte des Condoléances au Soleil*, or some other equally illustrative poems. Vielé-Griffin is another example. Who would guess from the short lyrics adduced by Mr Eccles that this was the magnificent poet of *La Chevauchée d'Yeldis* and *Au Tombeau d'Hélène*, of that glorious series *L'Amour sacré*?

It would be ungracious not to acknowledge the value of much of Mr Eccles' work. The first half of the book is, on the whole, excellent, including the introduction, but Tristan l'Hermite deserved a passing word. There can be nothing but praise for the selection from Baudelaire, the only satisfactory excerpt from his work ever included in an

anthology. And there are others. The notices, too, are, almost without exception, excellent, and present in a handy form what I, for one, have often had to seek in a dozen different places. But I do not understand, to take only one point of difference, why Mr Eccles wonders whether Moréas 'will succeed in delivering a personality which is possibly vigorous from the nemesis of his triumphant assimilations'? Surely *Les Stances* are a sufficient reply. The bibliographical indications, also, in many cases, need thorough revision. The list of further references on the difficult matter of the theory of French verse given on p. 380, is quite inadequate. Becq de Fouquières, Ténint, Clair Tisseur, Sully-Prudhomme, Remy de Gourmont, are excellent authorities, each in his own way, but Saran and Wulff, at least, ought to have been mentioned, not to speak of many a French disciple or critic of Becq de Fouquières—M. de la Grasserie and Prof. Maurice Grammont, at any rate. The title of one of the manuals cited as of practical, not theoretic value, is given wrong; it is by Brandin and Hartog, not by Prof. Brandin alone. And Banville is quite valueless, except from the historical point of view.

The notes are on the whole well conceived. By why include translations? And why grammatical or etymological matter? Such notes as '*boule*, "sphere,"' '*morgue tranchante*, "peremptory pride"; the origin of *morgue* is unknown,' are unnecessary. '*Pâtir* was taken directly from Latin *pati* by learned men etc.' is wrong. These examples come from p. 338 and are comments on the first two passages in the book. Further examples of unnecessary notes are p. 338: '*l'exercice*, "drill."' p. 341: 'the luminous density of this line gives it a classical nobility'; 'this might really be Racine'; 'a flat, colourless, pretentious line.' p. 356: '*filon*, "vein."' p. 358: '*glapissent*, "yelp."' p. 370: '*brut*, "unhewn."' p. 372: 'a fine image'; 'this is positivism'; 'this is Walt Whitman.' p. 374: '*sans se le dire*, "unconsciously."' p. 374: 'we scrape the bottom of the trough and drink sour wine' (as a rendering of a quite easy line in passage CXXII). The notes on passage LXI, and some of those on passages CXI, CXVI, are wrong. Those on passage CXVI show, in conjunction with others, that Mr Eccles does not understand *vers libres*. The note on Furnes (p. 373) might have included a reference to Camille Lemonnier's *Petit Homme de Dieu*. On p. 374 the note on *aime-laine* is incorrect (cf. Brunot, *Histoire de la Langue française*, I, pp. 283–4). The etymology of *prud'homme* is also incorrect. The 'perhaps' in the note on *buccins* might be omitted.

It seems ungracious to pick Mr Eccles' work to pieces in this way, but the scheme of the book is so good that its execution ought to be brought up to the level of the scheme. I trust that in a new edition—which ought certainly to be called for, for, in spite of all, Mr Eccles' book is the best anthology of nineteenth-century French poetry published in England—the author will see his way to make the selection really representative, to rewrite many of his notes and bring his appendix up to the mark required by modern scholarship.

THOMAS B. RUDMOSE-BROWN.

DUBLIN.

Ugo Foscolo in Inghilterra. Saggi. Da Francesco Viglione. Catania: Vincenzo Muglia. 1910. 8vo. vi + 330 pp.

Signor Viglione having had the opportunity and the patience to catalogue the Foscolo papers in the Labronica library has drawn from them a considerable amount of interesting information, which he brings to light in this volume.

A number of minor points in Foscolo's biography are elucidated and a number of mistakes in the edition of Foscolo's works are pointed out. If these were the only results achieved by Signor Viglione he would be well entitled to the thanks of all admirers of Foscolo. The ponderous volumes in the Labronica have so long deterred the student from making an exhaustive examination of them, that we welcome with real pleasure a work giving us the most important results of painstaking labours. At least we know now what to expect from the Labronica MSS. The English reader will find in this volume not a few unpublished documents and references relating to some of the many friends Foscolo made during his exile, among others to Hobhouse, Frere, J. H. Merivale, W. S. Rose, Campbell, H. Hallam, Lord John Russell, Lord and Lady Holland, Lord Glenbervie, Lady Dacre and Hudson Gurney. The little scandal which raged around Lady Sidney Morgan and her Italian friends is recalled here and elucidated, I believe, for the first time (pp. 80—90). During the first year of his residence in England Foscolo had intended to write a comprehensive work in the form of letters, comparing English and Italian customs. Its general title was to have been *Il Gazzettino del Bel Mondo*; but difficulties about the translation into English and Murray's doubts about its probable sale caused the design to be abandoned. Some extracts from the MSS. were printed in the *Opere*, but the plan of the work, and many particulars have, as Viglione shows, been hopelessly muddled by the well meaning editor. Viglione avers that the 'poetessa coronata in Campidoglio' whom Foscolo attacks was Madame de Staël. He shared Frere's opinion 'c'est toujours de l'emphase' (pp. 167—168), an opinion worthy of consideration when one bears in mind the great admiration Leopardi entertained for this lady. Foscolo however published a chapter of the *Gazzettino*, translated by Francis Cohen, or Palgrave as he wished to be called, in the *Quarterly Review* of April 1819, mainly dealing with chevaleresque poetry and with its English imitations. We find here also a passage of a letter by Frere on his imitation of the *ottava rima* in his *Whistelcraft*. In fact the attempt itself originated in reading Ginguené's account of Pulci in which some extracts are inserted as characteristic of his style. 'I was so struck with them that though it was late at night when I came home and accidentally took up the book I could not go to bed till I had translated them, and for a week after could neither think or dream of anything but Pulci; it appeared that his ingenious and humorous assumption of the vulgar character and vernacular phrase and rude popular attempts at poetry among his countrymen were capable of being transferred *mutatis mutandis* to the English nation and the present times.' (pp. 169—170.)

In connection with the same *Quarterly* article we get excerpts from letters from Mr G. N. Fazakerley (?) giving his guarded opinion about Frere and Rose; and from Hobhouse criticising severely Rose's work and abilities, though advising Foscolo to deal leniently with him. Further on we find letters from Lord Glenbervie, seeking Foscolo's advice for the introduction to his *Ricciardetto*, and from Wyffen concerning his *Gerusalemme*. Merivale appears also (p. 192) as the reviser of some attempts by Foscolo at English verse; and of course the whole controversy between Foscolo and Hobhouse is fully discussed. Yet if such references would specially interest the English reader, Viglione, we must not forget, has another purpose in view: Foscolo's biography. In the preface he apologizes for giving so many documents; but we think the apology superfluous, as the value of the book lies in the documents, and we are specially in his debt for the care and order with which he has arranged the very abundant material. Viglione is a young man; one feels the effect of this enviable defect in many a passage. In fact now and again, mainly when he introduces a new subject, draws conclusions or generalizes, the jog-trot of his prose is whipped into unnecessary high-stepping. One cannot refrain from thinking that if Viglione had left aside most of the reminiscences of his classical and philosophical readings he would spare his readers some useless and dissonant passages (e.g. pp. 29, 39, 70, 104, 119, 155). In such passages and in those where he strives to justify at all costs Foscolo's business methods, Viglione falls short of our expectations. Surely no one thinks nowadays of judging Foscolo by the standard of a heartless accountant. True enough he was arrested in November 1824 for a trifling debt, when he had weathered a much heavier storm. But all justifications are purposeless; let any one judge as he may. A prig will always frown upon Foscolo's behaviour, out of mere constitutional dislike; but anyone with some experience and with some knowledge of the peculiar unfitness for business in many a genius will be interested and sympathetic, and utterly unconcerned by the grumblings of Mrs Grundy, no matter whether British or foreign.

There is however a big blemish in this work. I can quite appreciate the difficulties of printing in Sicily English extracts, especially when the originals are faulty or difficult to read, but now that Italian scholarship is on a level with that of other nations, it is inexcusable that an Italian scholar should turn out a book dotted all through with uncouth blunders. The author tells us that he, quite properly, edited the passages which appeared to him to be faulty, but if his knowledge of English was inadequate he could easily have found the necessary help[1].

[1] Lest my words should appear too severe I give a few instances of the faults I am hinting at, leaving aside those that are clearly to be ascribed to the compositor: p. 76 *theall* = the hall; p. 77 *pater* = pattern; p. 103 *fortitude* = destitution (?); p. 137 *to* you choose = if you choose; p. 137 *unless* = useless; p. 140 I *fail* = I fell. If these mispellings are in the originals it should have been pointed out, at least. The list could be easily swelled, but there are mistakes of a different kind: thus *oil-cloth* is not *panno* (p. 75), but *tela cerata* or *linoleum*; p. 103 *Miss* Compton ought no doubt to be *Mrs*; p. 117 *fierezza catulliana* is rather surprising, since the melodious poet never endeavoured,

Apart from this the book contains a most valuable amount of first hand information carefully arranged, and since another volume is to appear shortly we may be allowed to hope that it will be sobered in the general remarks and, above all, that it will be more carefully revised.

C. Foligno.

Oxford.

Danish Conversation-Grammar. By E. J. Thomas. Heidelberg: Julius Groos. 1911. 8vo. viii + 372 pp.

This book is an English adaptation of Wied's *Dänische Konversations-Grammatik*, written according to the well known Gaspey-Otto-Sauer method. A quarter of the Grammar is taken up with a full and careful account of the pronunciation of Danish. No modern language has suffered more at the hands of English teachers in the past, and one must extend a cordial welcome to a grammar which places at the disposal of the English student the careful phonetic analysis of the sounds of Danish which we owe to Dr Jespersen and others. The system of the 'Association internationale phonétique' is used in the transcription of words and extracts, and in spite of the laborious nature of the task which the editor has set himself his work is extremely accurate. Phonetic methods are specially necessary in the teaching of Danish, which is one of the most difficult of modern European languages to speak, and they are used here to excellent purpose. One must, I think, quarrel with Mr Thomas's advice to the student to neglect the glottal stop until he has an opportunity of hearing Danish spoken. The glottal catch is as essential to the genius of Danish speech as the *liaison* to that of French and one can no more afford to neglect the one than the other. Mr Thomas' reason for his advice is the difficulty of acquiring it; but it is so prevalent in some of the dialects of England and Scotland (at least in certain positions) that there is no real difficulty in studying it at first hand; for example, the dropping of t or rather its reduction to the glottal stop in the vulgar pronunciation of 'let us' is as common in English as it is in the colloquial Danish 'lad os.'

The rest of the Grammar is on more ordinary and commonplace lines—divided strictly according to the parts of speech and following the old grammatical lines. It suffers from being neither strictly conversational (as it professes to be) nor strictly literary (as it often tends to be). Full as the book is of information on both aspects of the language, it is probable that if one relied on it very far in the endeavour to learn to speak Danish, one's language would often be old-fashioned, stilted or formal. In this respect it compares unfavourably with Miss Forchammer's little book *How to learn Danish*, which has now

to my knowledge, to usurp Marcus Porcius Cato's austere claims; and lastly at p. 124 and p. 130 we meet with a rather extraordinary anglicism: 'l'autore doveva ogni anno *liberare* non meno di tre e non più di sei volumi.' Surely it ought to have been written: '*consegnare*'!

appeared in editions adapted for the chief European nations. These shortcomings are of course due not to the editor but to the system under which he writes, and when all is said, we must extend a hearty welcome to a book containing the fullest account of the Danish language which has yet appeared in English.

ALLEN MAWER.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

MINOR NOTICES.

Mr Herbert E. Cory in his Dissertation *The Critics of Edmund Spenser* (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, 1911) aims at shewing that the high appreciation of Spenser as a poet has been continuous in English literature, each age however appreciating him in its own way, and protests against the idea that the perception of his merits in the eighteenth century was a sign of the coming of romanticism. He maintains, moreover, with more or less success, that the criticism of the eighteenth century seized some points with regard to Spenser's poetical work which were unduly neglected in the nineteenth. His collection of critical references to Spenser is a useful one, but his distinction of periods is not very happy (the 'Age of Reason' and the 'Age of Literary Anarchy' for the former and the latter halves of the seventeenth century), and his style needs some castigation. The following are examples from the first few pages of the essay: 'Volcanic floods of rhetoric on the subject now harden and glisten in countless volumes.' 'We can only say vaguely that Ben Jonson of the rocky face and mountain belly stood like a rock of reason in the very midst of the turbulent ocean of enthusiasm, scarred, sullen, but immovable, a prophet of the age at hand.' 'So it was at the close of the seventeenth century. "Hallelujah!" shouted the Elizabethans. "But hold," murmured the rationalists. After that the deluge.' It may be added that there are rather too many misprints.

G. C. M.

On the occasion of the centenary of Koltsóv's birth celebrated in 1909, a number of studies appeared in Russia, both in magazines and in book-form, devoted to the poet's life and work. Dr P. Schalfejew's *Die volkstümliche Dichtung A. Kol'covs und die russische Volkslyrik* (Berlin: Duncker, 1910), appearing a year later, seems intended for German students of Russian literature who have not access to or are unable to avail themselves of Russian sources of information. A concise Introduction treats of the stylistic devices of the folk-poetry, of which devices lists are given, further, a brief account of Koltsóv's lyrical predecessors, and

then the author takes up his main task, which is to determine how far Koltsóv has succeeded in reproducing in his lyrics the spirit and methods of the naive and charming poetry of the Russian peasants. The greater part of the book is taken up by a detailed examination of the poems with numerous quotations, of which a literal German version is given, but there is no attempt at a critical estimate of Koltsóv's debt to the poetry which he knew and loved so well. Still, Dr Schalfejew in his modest study gives a good idea of the manner in which the poet has 'gone to the people.' A useful bibliography is given, including much that bears but remotely on Koltsóv. The occasional transcription, on a German basis, of parts of the text of the poems has a curious appearance, but it is possible that some German students of Russian literature may find such a transcription easier to read than the Russian. If so, Dr Schalfejew will have earned their gratitude.

W. J. S.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

September—November, 1911.

GENERAL.

Busse, B., Das Drama, II. Von Versailles bis Weimar. (Aus Natur und Geisteswelt, 288.) Leipzig, Teubner. 1 M.

Mackenzie, A. S., The Evolution of Literature. London, Murray. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Moriarty, W. D., The Function of Suspense in the Catharsis. Ann Arbor, Mich.

Northup, C. S., The Present Bibliographical Status of Modern Philology. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 2*s.* net.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

General.

Baillière, P., Poètes lyriques d'Italie et d'Espagne. Préface de G. Deschamps. Paris, Lemerre. 3 fr. 50.

D'Ancona, A., Viaggiatori e avventurieri. Florence, Sansoni. 5 L.

Studies in Honor of A. Marshall Elliott. 2 vols. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press. 7 dol. 50.

Latin.

Mantuanus, B., The Eclogues of. Edited by W. P. Mustard. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press. 1 dol. 50.

Italian.

Ariosto, L., Orlando furioso secondo le stampe del 1516 e del 1521 rivedute dall' autore. Riproduzione a cura di F. Ermini. Vol. II. Rome, E. Loescher. 40 L.

Barboni, L., Geni e capi ameni dell' Ottocento : richerche e ricordi intimi. Florence, Bemporad. 3 L. 50.

Berchet, G., Opere, a cura di E. Bellorini. Vol. I. Poesie. (Scrittori d' Italia, XVIII.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Carroll, J. S., In Patria. An Exposition of Dante's Paradiso. London, Hodder and Stoughton. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Della Porta, G. B., Le commedie a cura di V. Spampanato. Vol. II. (Scrittori d' Italia, XXI.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Filomusi, G. L., Nuovi studii su Dante. Città di Castello, S. Lapi. 8 L.

Finzi, G., Histoire de la littérature italienne des origines à nos jours, trad. par Mme Thiérard-Baudrillart. Paris, Perrin. 3 fr. 50.

Flecker, J. E., The Scholar's Italian Book. An Introduction to the study of the Latin origins of Italian. London, Nutt. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Grazzini, A. F. (Il Lasca), Scritti in prosa e in poesia, con introduzione e note di R. Fornaciari. (Biblioteca scolastica di classici italiani.) Florence, Sansoni. 2 L. 20.

Hauvette, H., Dante, introduction à l'étude de la Divine comédie. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Holbrook, R. T., Portraits of Dante, from Giotto to Raffael. A critical study. London, Lee Warner. 21*s.* net.

Jones, F. N., Boccaccio and his Imitators. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press (Cambridge, Univ. Press). 2*s.* net.

Laudi inedite dei Disciplinati umbri, scelte di sui codici più antichi da G. Galli. (Bibl. storica della letteratura italiana, x.) Bergamo, Istituto ital. d' arti grafiche. 10 L.

Lettere autobiografiche di scrittori dell' età moderna, scelte e commentate da L. di Francia. (Biblioteca scolastica di classici italiani.) Florence, Sansoni. 4 L.

Marletta, F., Il 'Trolio e Griselda' di Angelo Leonica. Contributo alla storia della varia fortuna del Boccaccio. Catania, Giannotta. 2 L.

Micheli, P. E., Francesco Redi letterato e poeta: saggio. Florence, Le Monnier. 3 L.

Per la Lingua d' Italia, di Isidoro Del Lungo, Ernesto Monaci, Pasquale Villari, Ferdinando Martini. Florence, Casa editr. italiana. 2 L.

Petrarch's secret; or the Soul's conflict with passion. Three Dialogues between himself and St Augustine. Transl. from the Latin by W. H. Draper. London, Chatto and Windus. 6*s.* net.

Studî letterari e linguistici dedicati a Pio Raina nel 40° anno del suo insegnamento. Scritti di 48 autori. Milan, Hoepli. 35 L.

Vico, G. B., L' autobiografia, il carteggio e le poesie varie, a cura di B. Croce. (Scrittori d' Italia, xi.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

French.

(*a*) *Old French.*

Faral, E., Courtois d'Arras, jeu du XIII^e^ siècle. (Les classiques français du moyen âge.) Paris, H. Champion. 80 c.

Paris, G., La vie de Saint Alexis, poème du XI^e^ siècle. Nouv. édition, rev. par M. Roques. (Les classiques français du moyen âge.) Paris, H. Champion. 1 fr. 50.

(*b*) *Modern French.*

Allem, M., Alfred de Musset. (La vie anecdotique et pittoresque des grands écrivains, xiii.) Paris, L. Michaud. 2 fr. 25.

Benoist, A., Le théâtre d'aujourd'hui. M. Donnay, P. Hervieu, Brieux, H. Lavedan, J. Lemaître. Paris, Soc. franç. d'impr. et de libr. 3 fr. 50.

Bossuet, J. B., Correspondance. 4 Tomes. Paris, Hachette. Each 7 fr. 50.

Bossuet, J. B., Œuvres choisies. 5 vols. Paris, Hachette. Each 1 fr. 25.

Bossuet, J. B., Œuvres choisies, avec introduction, bibliographie, notes, par J. Calvet. Paris, Hatier. 4 fr. 50.

Boyd, W., The Educational Theory of J. J. Rousseau. London, Longmans. 5*s.* net.

Brizeux, A., Œuvres, nouv. édit. par A. Dorchain. Tome iii. Paris, Garnier frères. 3 fr.

Buffenoir, H., Les Charmettes et J. J. Rousseau. Édition définitive. Paris, E. Paul. 2 fr.

Cabeen, C. W., L'influence de G. B. Marino sur la littérature française dans la première moitié du XVII^e siècle. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr.

Cassagne, A., La vie politique de F. de Chateaubriand. Tome I. Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 7 fr. 50.

Champion, P., Vie de Charles d'Orléans. (Bibl. du XV^e siècle, XIII.) Paris, H. Champion. 15 fr.

Chinard, G., L'Exotisme américain dans la littérature française du XVI^e siècle. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Duclaux, Mme, The French Ideal: Pascal, Fénelon and other Essays. London, Chapman and Hall. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Flaubert, G., Œuvres complètes. Bouvard et Pécuchet, suivi du Dictionnaire des idées reçues. Paris, L. Conard. 8 fr.

Hamel, F., Jean de la Fontaine. London, S. Paul. 16*s.* net.

Harmand, J., Madame de Genlis, sa vie intime et politique (1746–1830) Paris, Perrin. 5 fr.

Hugo, V., Œuvres complètes. Tome XXI. Paris, Ollendorff. 20 fr.

Maigron, L., Le romantisme et la mode. Paris, H. Champion. 10 fr.

Oulmont, Ch., Étude sur la langue de P. Gringoire. (Bibl. du XV^e siècle, XV.) Paris, H. Champion. 4 fr.

Oulmont, Ch., La poésie morale, politique et dramatique à la veille de la Renaissance. Pierre Gringoire. (Bibl. du XV^e siècle, XIV.) Paris, H. Champion. 7 fr. 50.

Oulmont, Ch., Les débats du clerc et du chevalier dans la littérature poétique du moyen âge, édit. historique et littéraire. Paris, H. Champion. 6 fr.

Paris, G., Penseurs et poètes. J. Darmesteter, F. Mistral, Sully Prud'homme, A. Bida, E. Renan, A. Sorel. Paris, Calmann-Levy. 3 fr. 50.

Pellisson, M., Les hommes de lettres au XVIII^e siècle. Paris, A. Colin. 3 fr. 50.

Racine, J., Œuvres inconnues, découvertes à la Bibliothèque impériale de St. Pétersbourg, par J. Bonnet. Archevêché d'Auch. 10 fr.

Rigal, E., De Jodelle à Molière. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Robertson, D. M., A History of the French Academy, 1635–1910. London, F. Unwin. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Rochette, A., L'esprit dans les œuvres poétiques de V. Hugo. Paris, H. Champion. 6 fr.

Rosset, Th., Entretien, doutes, critique et remarques du Père Bonhours sur la langue française (1671–92). Paris, A. Colin. 7 fr. 50.

Rosset, Th., Les origines de la prononciation moderne, étudiées au XVII^e siècle. Paris, A. Colin. 10 fr.

Rostand, E., Œuvres complètes. 5 Tomes. Paris, Lafitte. Each 12 fr.

Rousseau, J. B., Épigrammes, publiées sur les recueils manuscrits. Paris, Sansot. 4 fr.

Séché, L., Études d'histoire romantique. Les amitiés de Lamartine. 1^re série. Paris, Mercure de France. 7 fr. 50.

Thomas, E., M. Maeterlinck. London, Methuen. 5*s.* net.

Vinet, A., Études sur la littérature française au XIX^e siècle. Tome I. Mme de Staël et Chateaubriand. Paris, Fischbacher. 8 fr.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Gothic.

KLUGE, F., Die Elemente des Gotischen. (Paul's Grundriss der germanischer Philologie, 3. Aufl.) Strassburg, Trübner. 2 M. 25.

Scandinavian.

AASEN, I., Skrifter i Samling, trykt og utrykt. I. Hefte. Kristiania, Gyldendal. 50 ö.

BJÖRNSON, B., Aulestadbreve til Bergliot Ibsen. Kristiania, Gyldendal. 3 Kr. 70.

GOSSE, E., Two Visits to Denmark. London, Smith Elder. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

GRAVERSEN, H., Salmedigteren Thomas Kingo. En folkelig Fremstilling. Copenhagen, Indre Missions Forening. 1 Kr.

JUDD, F. A., Under the Swedish Colours: a short Anthology of Modern Swedish Poets. London, E. Matthews. 1*s.* net.

KIERKEGAARD, S., Papirer. Udgivne af P. A. Herberg og V. Kuhr. III. Bind. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 7 Kr.

MAYRHOFER, J., H. Ibsen. Ein literarisches Charakterbild. Berlin, Walther. 3 M.

MORTENSEN, J., Clas Livijns dramatiska författarskap. Stockholm, Bonnier. 10 Kr.

OEHLENSCHLÄGER, A., St Hans Aften Spil. Med Oplysninger udgivet af Dansklaererforeningen ved S. Gundel. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 60 ö.

PETTERSEN, H., Bibliotheca Norvegica. III. Norske Forfattere for 1814. Besknvende Katalog over deres værker. I. del. Kristiania, Cammermeyer. 45 Kr.

English.

(*a*) *General.*

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. Vol. II. Collected by H. C. Beeching. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 5*s.* net.

REIN, W., Die Mass- und Gewichtsbezeichnungen des Englischen. (Diss. Giessen.) Giessen, Heffeler und Meyer.

(*b*) *Old and Middle English.*

COURMONT, A., Studies on Lydgate's Syntax in the Temple of Glass. (Bibl. de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Univ. de Paris, XXVIII.) Paris, Alcan. 5 fr.

PATTERSON, F. A., The Middle English Penitential Lyric. A Study and Collection of Early Religious Verse. (Columbia Univ. Studies in English.) New York, Lemcke and Büchner; London, H. Frowde. 1 dol. 50 net.

Recluse, The, a Fourteenth Century Version of the Ancren Riwle, edited by J. Påhlsson. (Lunds Universitets Aarsskrift. N.F., Afd. I. Bd. 6. No. 1.) Lund, C. W. K. Gleerup. 5 Kr.

ROBIN, P. ANSELL, The Old Physiology in English Literature. London, Dent. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

ROYSTER, J. F., A Middle English Treatise on the Ten Commandments. Part II. Introduction. (North Carolina Studies in Philology, Vol. VIII.) Chapel Hill, Univ. Press.

(*c*) *Modern English.*

BACON, LORD, Essays. Edited with Introduction and Notes by A. S. Gaye. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 3*s.*

BADSTUBER, A., Joanna Baillie's Plays of the Passions. (Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, XXXIV.) Vienna, Braumüller. 5 Kr.

BAILEY, J., Poets and Poetry. Being Articles reprinted from the Literary Supplement of the Times. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 5*s.* net.

BARDI, P., Scrittori inglesi dell' ottocento. Bari, Laterza. 4 L.

COOK, E. T., The Life of Ruskin. 2 vols. London, G. Allen. 21*s.* net.

COOPER, LANE, A Concordance to the Poems of William Wordsworth. London, Smith Elder. 42*s.* net.

DIXON, W. MACNEILE, Thomas the Rhymer. Glasgow, Maclehose. 1*s.* net.

DOREN, C. VAN, The Life of Thomas Love Peacock. London, Dent. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

FIGGIS, D., Shakespeare : a Study. London, Dent. 5*s.* net.

FORSTER, J., The Life of Charles Dickens. Collected, arranged and annotated by B. W. Matz. 2 vols. Memorial Edition. London, Chapman and Hall. 25*s.* net.

Furnivall, F. J., A Volume of Personal Record. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

GRAY, TH., Essays and Criticisms. Edited by C. S. Northup. (Belles Lettres Series.) Boston, D. C. Heath (London, Harrap). 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

GOYSEK, S. VON, Milton und Caedmon. (Wiener Beiträge zur engl. Philologie, XXXV.) Vienna, Braumüller. 2 M.

GREENE, B. R.—R. B., Newes both from Heauen and Hell, 1593, and Greene's Funeralls, 1594. Reprinted with Notes, etc. by R. B. McKerrow. London, Sidgwick and Jackson. 5*s.* net.

GRIBBLE, F., The Romantic Life of Shelley and the sequel. London, Nash. 15*s.* net.

HARRIS, F., The Women of Shakespeare. London, Methuen. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

JUSSERAND, J. J., What to expect of Shakespeare. (First Annual Shakespeare Lecture, British Academy.) Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1*s.* net.

KNECHT, J., Die Kongruenz zwischen Subjekt und Prädikat und die 3. Person Pluralis Präsentis auf -s im Elisabethinischen Englisch. (Anglistische Forschungen, XXXIII.) Heidelberg, Winter. 4 M. 20.

LOW, S., De Quincey. (Masters of Literature.) London, Bell. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

MAIR, G. H., English Literature : Modern. (Home University Library.) London, Williams and Norgate. 1*s.* net.

MEAKIN, A. M. B., Hannah More : a biographical study. London, Smith Elder. 14*s.* net.

MELVILLE, L., The Life and Letters of L. Sterne. 2 vols. London, S. Paul. 28*s.* net.

MORGAN, C. E., The Rise of the Novel of Manners. New York, Columbia Univ. Press. 1 dol. 25 net.

NEILSON, W. A., The Chief Elizabethan Dramatists (excluding Shakespeare). Selected plays with notes, etc. London, Cassell. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

NICATI, W., Femme et poète. Elisabeth Browning. Paris, Perrin. 3 fr. 50.

SAINTSBURY, G., A History of English Criticism. Edinburgh, Blackwood. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

SAXELBY, F. O., A Thomas Hardy Dictionary. London, Routledge. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

SCHIPPER, J., James Shirley. Sein Leben und seine Werke. (Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, XXXVI.) Vienna, Braumüller. 14 M.

SHELLEY, P. B., Poems. Edited with notes by C. D. Locock. 2 vols. London, Methuen. 21*s.* net.

SIDGWICK, F., Legendary Ballads. With an Introduction. London, Chatto and Windus. 3*s.* net.

SIMPSON, P., Shakespearian Punctuation. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 5*s.* net.

STEVENSON, R. L., Letters. Edited by S. Colvin. New Edition. 4 vols. London, Methuen. 20*s.*

SWIFT, J., Correspondence. Edited by E. E. Ball. Vol. II. London, Bell. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

TAYLOR, R., The Political Prophecy in England. New York, Columbia Univ. Press. 1 dol. 25 net.

TUCKWELL, W., Lycidas. A Monograph. London, Murray. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

WALTERS, J. C., Phases of Dickens, the man, his message and his mission. London, Chapman and Hall. 5*s.* net.

WATT, H. A., Gorbuduc; or Ferrex and Porrex. (Bulletin of the Univ. of Wisconsin, No. 351. Phil. and Lit. Series, Vol. v. No. 1.) Madison, Wisconsin. 40 c.

WEAVER, J., Epigrammes in the Oldest Cut and Newest Fashion, 1599. Reprinted with notes etc., by R. B. McKerrow. London, Sidgwick and Jackson. 5*s.* net.

WESTON, J. L., Old English Carols from the Hill MS. London, Nutt. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

WILKINS, W. G., Charles Dickens in America. London, Chapman and Hall. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

YOUNG, W. A., A Dictionary of the Characters and Scenes in the Stories and Poems of Rudyard Kipling, 1886–1911. London, Routledge. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

German.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Language*).

ABEGG, E., Die Mundart von Urseren. (Beiträge zur schweizerdeutschen Grammatik, IV.) Frauenfeld, Huber. 2 fr. 50.

ENDERLIN, F., Die Mundart von Kesswil in Oberthurgau. (Beiträge zur schweizerdeutschen Grammatik, V.) Frauenfeld, Huber. 3 fr. 60.

GRIMM, J. und W., Deutsche Sagen. Einleitung von A. Stoll. Leipzig, Hesse und Becker. 1 M. 50.

WELLER, A., Die Sprache in den ältesten deutschen Urkunden des deutschen Ordens. (Germanistische Abhandlungen, XXXIX.) Breslau, M. und H. Marcus. 4 M. 40.

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German.*

Minnesangs Frühling, Des. Neu bearbeitet von F. Vogt. Leipzig, S. Hirzel. 7 M.

OCHS, E., Lautstudien zu Notker von St Gallen. Freiburg, Troemer. 2 M.

OPPEL, A., Das Hohelied Salomonis und die deutsche religiöse Liebeslyrik. (Leipziger historische Abhandlungen, XXXII.) Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer. 2 M. 50.

RANK, O., Die Lohengrinsage. Ein Beitrag zu ihrer Motivgestaltung und Deutung. (Schriften zur angewandten Seelenkunde, XIII.) Vienna, Deuticke. 5 M.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

ALT, K., Goethe und seine Zeit. (Wissenschaft und Bildung, XCIX.) Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer. 1 M.

APPELMANN, A., Der fünffüssige Iambus bei O. Ludwig, mit Beiträgen zur Textkritik, Sprache und Stoffgeschichte. Münster, A. Greve. 5 M. 60.

ARNIM, A. VON, Werke. Ausgewählt und herausg. von R. Steig. 3 Bände. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. Each 3 M.

Baumgartner, A., Goethe. Sein Leben und seine Werke. 3. Aufl. 1. Band. Freiburg, Herder. 10 M.

Beyer, P., Der junge Heine. Eine Entwicklungsgeschichte seiner Denkweise und Dichtung. (Bonner Forschungen, 1.) Berlin, Grote. 5 M.

Bieber, H., J. A. Schlegels poetische Theorie in ihrem historischen Zusammenhange untersucht. Teil 1. (Berlin Diss.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller.

Blanc, M., Étude littéraire sur les élégies romaines de Goethe. Paris, Berger-Levrault. 3 fr. 50.

Bobeth, J., Die Zeitschriften der Romantik. Leipzig, Haessel. 8 M.

Bode, W., Die Tonkunst in Goethes Leben. 2 Bände. Berlin, E. S. Mittler. 9 M.

Brahm, O., Das Leben Heinrich von Kleists. Neue Ausgabe. Berlin, E. Fleischel. 6 M.

Brecht, W., Heinse und der ästhetische Immoralismus. Zur Geschichte der italienischen Renaissance in Deutschland. Berlin, Weidmann. 6 M.

Büchner, W., Goethe's Faust. Eine Analyse der Dichtung. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 M.

Ehrenhaus, M., Die Operndichtung der deutschen Romantik. (Breslauer Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte, xxix.) Breslau, F. Hirt. 2 M. 50.

Fiedler, H. G., The Oxford Book of German Verse from the 12th to the 20th century. With a Preface by G. Hauptmann. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 6*s.* net.

Fischer, H., Die schwäbische Literatur im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert. Ein historischer Rückblick. Tübingen, H. Laupp. 3 M. 60.

Geiger, P., Volksliedinteresse und Volksliedforschung in der Schweiz vom Anfang des 18. Jahrh. bis zum Jahre 1830. Bern, A. Francke. 3 fr. 50.

Gloege, G., Novalis' 'Heinrich von Ofterdingen' als Ausdruck seiner Persönlichkeit. Eine ästhetisch-psychologische Stiluntersuchung. (Teutonia, xx.) Leipzig, Avenarius. 4 M.

Goethe, J. W. von, Götter, Helden und Wieland, nach der Hs. herausg. von K. Wolff. Leipzig, Rowohlt. 30 M.

Goethe, J. W. von, Werke. Herausg. im Auftrage der Grossherzogin Sophie von Sachsen. 1. Abt., 51. und 52. Band. Weimar, H. Böhlau. Each 5 M. 60.

Goethe, J. W. von, Wilhelm Meisters Theatralische Sendung. Herausg. von H. Maync. Stuttgart, Cotta. 38 M. (Popular edition, 2 M.)

Gutzkow, K., Werke, herausg. von P. Müller. 3. und 4. Band. Leipzig, Bibliograph. Institut. Each 2 M.

Hamerling, R., Sämtliche Werke in 16 Bänden. Herausg. von M. M. Rabenlechner. Leipzig, Hesse und Becker. 8 M.

Harnack, O., Aufsätze und Vorträge. Tübingen, Mohr. 7 M.

Hartmann, M., L. A. von Arnim als Dramatiker. (Breslauer Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte, xxiv.) Breslau, F. Hirt. 3 M. 40.

Herzog, W., Heinrich von Kleist. Sein Leben und sein Werk. Munich, Beck. 6 M. 50.

Houben, H. H., Jungdeutscher Sturm und Drang. Ergebnisse und Studien. Leipzig, Brockhaus. 10 M.

Humboldt, W. von, Neue Briefe an Schiller, 1796–1803. Herausg. von C. Ebrard. Berlin, Paetel. 4 M.

Hünich, F. A., Das Fortleben des älteren Volksliedes im Kirchenliede des 17. Jahrh. (Probefahrten, xxi.) Leipzig, Voigtländer. 1 M. 80.

Jacoby, G., Herder als Faust. Eine Untersuchung. Leipzig, Meiner. 7 M.

Kleist, H. von in seinen Briefen. Eine Charakteristik seines Lebens und Schaffens. Herausg. von E. Schur. Charlottenburg, Schiller-Buchhandlung. 2 M.

Köhler, W., C. F. Meyer als religiöser Charakter. Jena, Diederichs. 4 M.

Kürnberger, F., Gesammelte Werke. Herausg. von O. E. Deutsch. II. Band. Munich, G. Müller. 6 M.

Lahnstein, E., Hebbels Jugenddramen und ihre Probleme. Berlin-Zehlendorf, B. Behr. 3 M.

Lessing, G. E., Werke, herausg. von G. Witkowski. 7 Bände. Leipzig, Bibl. Institut. 14 M.

Lienhard, F., Wege nach Weimar. Beiträge zur Erneuerung des Idealismus. 6. Bd. Goethe. Stuttgart, Greiner und Pfeiffer. 3 M. 50.

Liliencron, D. von, Gesammelte Werke. Herausg. von R. Dehmel. In 8 Bänden. I.—III. Band. Berlin, Schuster und Loeffler. Each 4 M.

Lorm, H., Ausgewählte Briefe. Eingeleitet und herausg. von E. Friedegg. Berlin, K. Siegismund. 4 M.

Luterbacher, O., Die Landschaft in G. Kellers Prosawerken. (Sprache und Dichtung, VIII.) Tübingen, Mohr. 3 M.

Luther, M., Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. XLV. Band. Weimar, H. Böhlau. 23 M. 40.

Meyer, C., Die Romane von F. von Uechtritz. (Breslauer Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte, XXVI.) Breslau, F. Hirt. 2 M. 50.

Moschner, A., Holtei als Dramatiker. (Breslauer Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte, XXVIII.) Breslau, F. Hirt. 4 M. 60.

Nestroy, J., Ausgewählte Werke. Herausg. von F. Brukner. Leipzig, Hesse und Becker. 1 M. 50.

Noch, C., Grillparzers 'Ahnfrau' und die Wiener Volksdramatik. Leipzig, Wiegandt. 1 M. 20.

Riess, E., W. Heinses Romantechnik. (Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, XXXIX.) Weimar, Duncker. 3 M. 60.

Röhr, J., G. Hauptmanns dramatisches Schaffen. Eine Studie. Dresden, Pierson. 4 M.

Schubert, E., A. Bohse genannt Talander. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der galanten Zeit in Deutschland. (Breslauer Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte, XXVII.) Breslau, F. Hirt. 3 M.

Soergel, A., Dichtung und Dichter der Zeit. Eine Schilderung der deutschen Literatur der letzten Jahrzehnte. Leipzig, Voigtländer. 10 M. 50.

Splettstösser, W., Der Grundgedanke in Goethes Faust. Berlin, G. Reimer. 3 M. 50.

Stern, L., Die Varnhagen von Ensesche Sammlung in der kgl. Bibliothek zu Berlin, geordnet und verzeichnet. Berlin, Behrend. 15 M.

Stierling, H., Leben und Bildnis Friedrichs von Hagedorn. (Mitteilungen aus dem Museum für hamburgische Geschichte, XXVIII.) Hamburg, Gräfe und Sillem. 8 M.

Storm, G., Theodor Storm. Ein Bild seines Lebens. Jugendzeit. Berlin, Curtius. 3 M. 50.

Szymanzig, M., Immermanns Tristan und Isolde. (Beiträge zur deutschen Literaturwissenschaft, XVII.) Marburg, Elwert. 4 M. 50.

Trösch, E., Die helvetische Revolution im Lichte der deutsch-schweizerischen Dichtung. (Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- und Literaturgeschichte, X.) Leipzig, Haessel. 4 M. 60.

Wildenbruch, E. von, Gesammelte Werke. Herausg. von B. Litzmann. In 17 Bänden. I. und II. Band. Berlin, Grote. Each 4 M.